DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 457 906 JC 010 660

AUTHOR Kelly-Kleese, Christine
TITLE Community College Scholarship and Discourse: An Intrinsic Case Study.
PUB DATE 2001-05-00
NOTE 178p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, North Carolina State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Discourse; Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Discourse Communities; Educational Research; Faculty Publishing; Scholarly Writing; *Scholarship; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Schools

ABSTRACT

This dissertation reports the results of an intrinsic case study done at a technical community college in the southeastern United States. The purpose of the study was to understand how community college administrators and faculty members define scholarship at their institution and what methods are used within the community college to encourage/discourage participation in scholarly work. The author conducted 25 individual interviews: two with upper-level sectional administrators, 22 with full-time faculty members, and with a continuing part-time instructor. The 23 faculty members interviewed represented all of the departments on campus. Questions included: (1) How do administrators and faculty define scholarship? and (2) What are some ways scholarship is supported or discouraged on campus? Findings showed that while some community college faculty engaged in scholarly activities that would be accepted as scholarship under traditional definitions of the term, those who did engage were intrinsically motivated and were communicating primarily with an audience outside the community college discourse community. The primary means of engaging in scholarship at this particular college was often social in nature and immediate in result and, as such, it was more in line with what is more commonly understood within academe as professional development, not scholarship. The value of scholarship and scholarly discourse in this case was determined in large part by its ability to improve teaching and learning at the institution. (Contains 91 references.) (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 457 906

KELLY-KLEESE, CHRISTINE. Community College Scholarship and Discourse: An Intrinsic Case Study. (Under the direction of Dr. George B. Vaughan and Dr. John Pettitt).

This dissertation reported the results of an intrinsic case study done at a technical community college in the southeastern United States. A qualitative research methodology was used to take an ethnographic picture of the issues surrounding community college scholarship. An interpretive theoretical frame informed the study. The methods employed were interviewing and document review. The purpose of this study was to come to an understanding of how community college administrators and faculty members define scholarship at their institution and what methods are used within the community college for the production of and participation in scholarly work. The study was also designed to identify some of the impediments and supports that currently exist for faculty and administrators who wish to engage in scholarship. The initial research questions were as follows:

1. How do community college instructional administrators and faculty members at this institution define scholarship?
2. How do the historical context of the institution, the college culture, and the state community college system influence faculty members' current understanding of community college scholarship?

TC010660

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Christine Kelly-Kleese
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

3. What influences a community college instructional administrator or faculty member's decision to pursue or not pursue scholarly work?
4. What types of scholarly discourse do faculty members engage in?
5. What institutional procedures, policies, and practices are in place that affect the faculty members' ability to engage in scholarship?
6. What are some of the ways scholarship is supported or discouraged on campus?
7. How might community college faculty create opportunities to engage in and promote their scholarly discourse?

Findings showed that while some community college faculty engage in scholarly activities that would be accepted as scholarship under traditional definitions of the term, those who do engage are intrinsically motivated and are communicating primarily with an audience outside the community college discourse community. The primary means of engaging in scholarship at this college is often social in nature and immediate in result, and, as such, it is more in line with what is more commonly understood within academe as professional development, not scholarship. The value of scholarship and scholarly discourse in this case was determined in large part by its ability to improve teaching and learning at the institution.

For community college scholars everywhere

Biography

The researcher was born and raised in Northern New York, along with her six siblings. After earning a Bachelor's degree in English Education at the State University of New York at Plattsburgh, she moved to the South to pursue a Master of Arts in Teaching English at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1990-1992). She began the doctoral program in Higher Education Administration at North Carolina State University in 1997. She has worked as a community college administrator and faculty member for eight years. The researcher lives in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, with her husband, Tony, and their two cats, Emerson and Batavia.

Acknowledgements

Profound thanks go to a number of people who have greatly influenced me during the process of completing my education to this point and in completing this dissertation, most recently.

Thank-you, Mom and Dad, for always emphasizing the importance of education within our family and for supporting me in so many ways. Thank-you, big sister Maureen, for being there for the writing break phone calls and for offering support in my endeavors. Thank-you, Tony, my husband, stress-reliever, and confidant; your patience (and well-timed absences) helped me more than you know.

To Dr. John Pettitt, thanks for convincing me to start the program and to pursue qualitative research, and thanks for being great with the paperwork.

Thanks, also, to Dr. Iris Weisman for offering advice from afar and for steering me in the right direction on the topic of discourse communities. And thanks, Dr. Carol Kasworm, for stepping in when I needed you and for providing such strong leadership to the department.

To Dr. Peter Hessling, a million thanks for being such a wonderful teacher and all-'round great guy. You truly have gone above and beyond in your efforts to teach students to be good qualitative researchers. Your hours of reading and constructive commenting have not gone unnoticed.

Dr. George Vaughan, your constructive criticism, support, and candor have been so valuable to me. Thank-you for demanding the best and for

encouraging me to be a scholar . . . in the traditional sense of the word! You've shown me that you're more than a mentor; you've been a true sponsor.

Finally, to Dr. Rosemary Gillett-Karam, many thanks for making much of my coursework thought-provoking and for being such a wonderful role model for women in higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: Background and Theoretical Framework

Context 1
- The College 1
- The Service Area 5
- The Faculty 5

Purpose Statement 7

Definition of Terms 8

Theoretical Framework 11

Research Questions 13

Limits of the Study 14

How Theory Informs the Study 15

Pilot Study 17
- Definition of Community College Scholarship 17
- Importance of Community College Scholarship 18
- Motivation 18
- Promoting Scholarship 19
- Impediments 19
- Value of Scholarship 20
- The Social Nature of Community College Scholarship 21
- Conclusions 22

CHAPTER TWO: Review of the Literature **23**

The History of Scholarship in the Community College 23
- Extension of High School 23
- Expanding Educational Opportunities 25
- Widespread Growth of the Community College 28
- Community College Instruction Comes Under Attack 30
- The Present and Future of Community College Scholarship 32
- The Current Reality 36

A Turning Point? 37
Review of the Literature Regarding Interpretivism as a Theoretical Frame for Case Study Research 42
The Roots of Interpretivism 44
Interpretivism and Case Study Research 47
The Community College as a Discourse Community within the Larger Discourse Community of Higher Education 51
Social Constructionism and Discourse Community 52
Communicative Competence 53
Boundaries 54
Power and Influence in a Discourse Community 55
CHAPTER THREE: Methodology **59**
Qualitative Research as Chosen Methodology 59
Sampling Procedure and Justification 59
Timeline 64
Data Collection 65
Interviews 65
Documents 68
Data Analysis 69
Simultaneous Collection and Analysis 69
Constant Comparison 70
Organizing and Coding the Data 71
Writing the Report 72
Validity 73
Internal Validity 73
External Validity (Generalizability) 74
Reliability 75
My Role as Researcher 76
Possible Strengths and Biases 80

Ethics 82
Anonymity 83
Documents 84
Resources Needed 85
CHAPTER FOUR: Interpretation of the Data **87**
Definitions 89
Community College Scholarship: Process or Product? 91
Members or Guests? 99
Culture of the College 100
Scholarship Is Valued . . . Or Is It? 100
Subliminal Messages 103
Scholarship is Like a Horse 104
Scholarship is Icing on the Cake 105
Choosing to Engage 106
Who Are Community College Scholars? 108
Scholarly Goat Herders 108
Who Should; Who Does? 110
Importance of Scholarship 113
Examples of Scholarship 116
Impediments 121
Promoting Community College Scholarship 124
Rewarding Community College Scholarship 126
Current Changes -- Future Trends 127
Final Comments 132
CHAPTER FIVE: Implications **139**
This Study's Contribution 139
Opportunities for Further Research 142
Implications for Community Colleges 142
Recommended Practices 144

References 146

Appendices 157

Appendix A: Interview Guide 158

Appendix B: Introductory Letters 160

Appendix C: Consent Form 162

Appendix D: Definitions 165

Appendix E: Informants 166

CHAPTER ONE: Background and Theoretical Framework

Context

To understand the nature of scholarship at this institution, I see the current realities as having evolved from the history of the college and the community college system as a whole. This context, I think, is helpful in understanding the current state of being a faculty member here. As Marshall and Rossman (1999) point out, "historical analysis is particularly useful in qualitative studies for establishing a baseline or background prior to . . . interviewing" (p. 123). I have used historical accounts of this state's community college system's genesis written by current and former leaders of the community college system in this state. The information relevant to the genesis and original mission of the college has allowed me to "determine the direction of cause-and-effect relationships" regarding the issues in the case (Marshall and Rossman, 1999, p. 124). Further, according to Marshall and Rossman (1999), "systematic historical analysis enhances the trustworthiness and credibility of a study" (p. 124).

The College

This college is located in the southeastern United States. Its genesis was as an industrial education center in the early 1960s. In 1965, the State Board of Education redefined it as a technical institute, and, for political reasons, the college retained its name as a technical college when it adopted a university transfer mission and name of community college in the mid

1980s. While they are clearly now similar in mission and governance, not all community colleges in this state had the same genesis and, therefore, do not carry the technical college persona as a clear part of their names or their culture.

The institution is among the largest in the state, serving just under 8,000 curriculum students annually (unduplicated headcount) and a total of more than 18,000 students annually in some capacity (curriculum, continuing education, basic skills instruction, compensatory education, and such). The college is located in a geographic area that boasts more than ten universities, some prestigious, within driving distance of its residents. The mission of the college, as stated in its Fact Book 99, is as follows:

> Established as an alternative to traditional postsecondary institutions, the College's historical mission is to provide postsecondary technical and vocational education supported by liberal arts, science, and basic skills courses to meet workforce training needs of the residents, businesses, and industries in [its service area]. The College also seeks to inspire an active desire for lifelong learning. Financially and geographically, [the College] provides an educational opportunity not otherwise available to area adults. (Nagy, 1999, p. 4)

More specifically, the college's employee handbook identifies seven objectives it now strives to meet, including meeting the needs of the

growing population of students who come here with a wish to transfer on to a university to continue their education. These objectives are as follows:

- To offer adults . . . the full range of educational programs and services that provide for basic skills improvement, high school completion, workplace entry and advancement, academic opportunities, knowledge for the global workplace, and personal growth;
- To offer postsecondary technical education that develops the entry-level skills and knowledge required for students' successful employment as qualified technicians and skilled craftspersons;
- To offer educational and training opportunities that enhance and upgrade workers' skills necessary to meet the challenges of a changing workplace;
- To offer a two-year course of study in the liberal arts and sciences that may be used as the first and second years of a baccalaureate degree;
- To offer training that addresses the needs of new, expanding, and existing industry in [the college's service area];
- To offer instruction that is of the highest quality and provides accessible, student-centered educational services within a supportive learning environment; and
- To provide appropriate service programs that promote cultural enrichment and foster a sense of civic responsibility.

In anticipation of the turn of the century, the college is embarking on a process for developing a new vision, one that holds renewed commitments to teaching and learning as its foci. The chief academic officer here is dedicated to this renewed commitment to teaching and learning and to faculty development and renewal. The college goes through a process of identifying

biennial goals and is committed to a clear planning and evaluation system it calls its Institutional Effectiveness process. The current goals for 1999-2001 are as stated below:

1. Ensure that all graduates demonstrate mastery of critical competencies as stated for each program;
2. Promote learning through the full range of instructional methods;
3. Foster the development of a well-prepared and professional faculty and staff;
4. Serve the residents of [the service area] with educational programs that meet their needs and are consistent with the College's mission and purpose;
5. Instill in students a commitment to lifelong learning;
6. Participate as an active partner in the educational community;
7. Engage in continuous improvement to promote a flexible, responsive, and dynamic institution focused on teaching and learning;
8. Implement and utilize appropriate technology that enhances efficiency and effectiveness of instruction and support services;
9. Assist in workforce development by actively seeking training partnerships that respond to employer needs and meet service area demands; and
10. Encourage students and employees to assume active roles in the College, in the community, and in the global workplace.

This institution has recently reorganized its Instructional Services Division, combining the General Education and University Transfer Departments, among other changes. The merger of these two departments can be seen as an opportunity to bring academic faculty together under one umbrella; it can also be seen as foreshadowing of things to come. There is some speculation

about the need to expand students' opportunities for transfer to four-year schools from more and more degree programs within the college, not just from the university transfer program (now called the Arts, Sciences, and University Transfer Department). Other academic departments include Business Technologies, Public Services Technologies, Health Technologies, and Industrial and Engineering Technologies.

The Service Area

The college's internal fact book, published by its Department of Evaluation and Research Services, offers information about the college's service area. This college serves a two-county area with an estimated total population in 1998 of 310,056 and a service area of residents over seventeen years of age of 239,193 (students must be at least eighteen to attend the college without approval). The percentage of the service population enrolled at the college in 1997-98 was 7.55%. While the percentages of population by race in the 1990 census reports that 37% of residents are black and 61% are white, this college's enrollment reports boast no ethnic majority among the student body. The college leaders identify this fact as one of the indications of the true culture of diversity that exists at the college.

The Faculty

According to internal publications circulated by the institution's Department of Evaluation and Research Services in 2000, the college employs 113 full-time faculty members and 401 part-time faculty; faculty members

make up half of the college's full-time employees. Fifty-four full-time faculty members are male, while fifty-nine are female. Among the full-time faculty, twenty are classified as Black, four as Asian, four as Hispanic, eighty-four as White, and one as American Indian.

At this time, 24% of the full-time faculty members at the college have earned bachelors as their highest degree; 51% of the full-time faculty members have earned masters as their highest degree (some are in or have been in the process of obtaining a doctorate); 15% of the full-time faculty members have earned doctorates as their highest degree. (The majority of faculty positions require the masters as a minimum qualification; a doctorate is not required for faculty positions at this institution).

Just recently, the faculty members created a faculty council, giving them an organized voice and a new forum for sharing their discourse. This college is one of seven colleges in the system that both retains the title of *technical* community college and has a faculty senate or association. The Faculty Council is currently discussing the possibility of instituting a system for faculty rank at the college (currently, all faculty are given the title of Instructor here); this move is not sanctioned by the administration yet not blocked by the administration, either. The new ranking system would not be tied to salary considerations; it would merely offer faculty a range of titles.

Purpose Statement

The terms higher education and academe are catch-all terms that are often used in a general sense to refer to all postsecondary institutions, institutions of higher learning -- public universities, private universities, junior colleges, and community colleges. But, when looked at individually, one can see that the various institutions are in many fundamental ways, such as in their histories, missions, and organizational structures, quite dissimilar. These dissimilarities make it likely that a general understanding of language used to describe the realities of all of higher education or academe are more accurate for some institutions than others. When the definitions of professional terminology and modes of discourse accepted within the dominant institutions (i.e. universities) come to be accepted as prescribed meanings and modes for other institutions (such as community colleges), alternatives are not shared, and voices of individuals outside the dominant institutions can be silenced or undervalued. Such is the problem expressed in the pilot of this case study and that I have explored in this study.

In my exploration of this problem, I conducted a study designed to investigate the term scholarship as it is understood by community college faculty. I have come to a better understanding of the nature of community college scholarship at one institution and how it differs from the accepted definition and nature of scholarship within academe. A result of this study will be a contribution to the existing literature regarding scholarship within

academe, generally, and within the community college, specifically. I anticipate that this study may have benefits for community college faculty, not just at this institution but in any community college setting. The study offers participants and readers an opportunity to think critically about community college scholarship and, perhaps, serves as an impetus for a new understanding of community college scholarship within academe. This particular study is novel in that it takes the form of an intrinsic case study, from an insider's perspective, and that it looks to define the term emically rather than using a prescribed definition of scholarship.

Definition of Terms

The notion of the community college as a discourse community is relevant to this study. A more in-depth discussion of this term and its implications will be offered in chapter two. The core of the discussion relates to the type of traditional scholarship that is accepted within academe; this type of scholarship belongs to a discourse community that can be seen as separate from the community college. Community college faculty must join and learn the accepted methods and modes of production within academe if they wish to have their scholarship valued within higher education. This discussion is akin to the current debate regarding whether applied knowledge is less valued than theoretical knowledge; much of the scholarly discourse within the community college appears to be of an applied nature as opposed

to the arguably more (or less) valued discourse focusing on theoretical knowledge.

Before attempting to define community college scholarship emically, I begin with the current, accepted definition of scholarship as it is traditionally defined. There has been, since the 1980's, a movement within the higher education discourse community to redefine its terminology in such a way that community college faculty and administrators can work within the existing mission of their institutions, understanding it as supportive of, perhaps even premised on, the pursuit, maintenance, and promotion of scholarship. In an effort to facilitate this, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) linked scholarship closely to the work of community college faculty, calling for the use of classrooms as laboratories to feed scholarship. In 1988, Vaughan defined scholarship, in part, in this way: ". . . scholarship is the umbrella under which research falls, for research is but one form of scholarship. Scholarship results in a product that is shared with others and that is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product . . . Scholarship requires that one have a solid foundation in one's professional field and that one keep up with the developments in that field" (27). Boyer (1990) opened up the definition even further, suggesting that teaching itself be considered a form of scholarship.

Coming to a clear understanding of scholarship within the community college is a critical step toward valuing the scholarship that occurs within and

emanates from these institutions. We must not see the community college's primary mission of teaching as antithetical to the production of scholarship. As Vaughan (1991) points out, "community college faculty and administrators need to change their existing attitudes toward scholarship and to view it from the perspective of the community college mission" (3).

In 1991, Vaughan stated that "it seems as if the community college may be at a turning point in its attitude toward scholarship" (10). Scholarship among community college professionals continues to be a topic of debate and of concern; faculty are still trying to determine the hows and whys of valuing scholarship at their institutions. Studies report information on many aspects of the debate, including how scholarship affects the vitality of faculty (Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993) and how community college administrators regard faculty scholarship (Marshood, 1995). Because these attitudes are changing, community college scholarship is a topic worthy of continued probing and discussion within the higher education community. Vaughan states that in order for community colleges to remain an important force in higher education, they must continue to have open access and comprehensiveness, but the future also demands faculty and administrative vitality which may be gained through scholarship (1984, p. 38-44). Scholarship is not separate from the original (and current) mission of the community college; on the contrary, it is integral to it. But if community college professionals are to be encouraged to engage in scholarship, I believe

the starting point is to understand how they understand the nature of community college scholarship in its own right, as defined by the practitioners within their discourse community. A reiteration of these points and a more in-depth discussion of this issue will be offered in chapter two.

Theoretical Framework

I conducted an ethnographic, intrinsic case study using an interpretive lens. Decisions for the chosen methodology and theoretical framework are based on careful consideration of the problem and the manner best suited for generating rich data. Ethnography and qualitative research techniques are essential. They center on the involvement of both the researcher and the informants. Ethnography and qualitative research techniques focus on the constructed meanings of those involved and how they make sense of their environments (Erickson, 1986). The following discussion forms the basis for my decisions:

Because I conducted my research at one community college -- a bounded system -- in an attempt to understand its culture and shared realities regarding scholarship, an ethnographic case study methodology was warranted. As LeCompte and Preissle (1993) describe them, ethnographies "are analytic descriptions or reconstructions of intact cultural scenes and groups (Spradley and McCurdy (1972). [They] re-create for the reader the shared beliefs, practices, artifacts, folk knowledge, and behaviors of some group of people" (p. 2-3). And, as Merriam (1999) explains,

> case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved . . . [it includes] intensive descriptions and analyses of a single unit or bounded system . . . [and is] often framed within the concepts, models, and theories from anthropology, history, sociology, psychology, and educational psychology. (p. 19)

I chose an interpretive lens because it allowed me to conduct the study in a collaborative manner, coming to conclusions through the use of discourse between my informants and myself. As LeCompte and Preissle define it, interpretive research is "framed by descriptions of, explanations for, or meanings given to phenomena by *both* the researcher and the study participants rather than by the definitions and interpretations of the researcher alone" (1993, p. 31-32). I shared the interpretive process with my informants, asked for some verification that I had reflected their perspectives, and remained cognizant of any sections that might be problematic for them if published. Their input guided my organization of the findings and helped me develop new ideas and interpretations. The sharing of perspectives helped us all grow in our understanding of the issues in the case (see Glesne and Peshkin, 1992, p. 147).

The qualitative approach hinges on understanding the definition of scholarship as it is described emically. Allowing my informants to define their reality without my prescription was essential; I believe, as do LeCompte and

Preissle (1993), that "the use of researcher constructs puts words in the mouths of participants and presents a view more congruent with the researcher's status position and perspectives than it is of the people being studied" (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993, p. 45). My interpretive framework allowed me to "explain, translate, and interpret [my informants'] perceived reality . . . interpreting and recounting accurately the meanings which research participants give to the reality around them" (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993, p. 31).

Research Questions

The purpose of this case study was to come to an understanding of the nature of community college scholarship at one institution. I looked at how instructional administrators and faculty members define scholarship at one institution and what methods are used within the community college for the production of and participation in scholarly work. The study was also designed to identify some of the impediments and supports that currently exist for faculty and administrators within the community college who wish to engage in scholarship as they define it. My initial questions were as follows:

1. How do community college instructional administrators and faculty members at this institution define scholarship?
2. How do the historical context of the institution, the college culture, and the state community college system influence faculty members' current understanding of community college scholarship?

3. What influences a community college instructional administrator or faculty member's decision to pursue or not pursue scholarly work?
4. What types of scholarly discourse do faculty members engage in?
5. What institutional procedures, policies, and practices are in place that affect the faculty members' ability to engage in scholarship?
6. What are some of the ways scholarship is supported or discouraged on campus?
7. How might community college faculty create opportunities to engage in and promote their scholarly discourse?

Limits of the Study

Because I conducted an intrinsic case study, the discussion is limited to this one institution, with its individual history, administrative structure, culture, and discourse community. While I suspect much of the findings will be informative and useful for readers, the issues in the case were explored within the context of this one site. The data and findings presented are not meant to be generalized to other colleges; they are but a contribution to the literature on the subject of community college scholarship and an insider's perspective on the shared reality of the informants and the researcher in this case study. Hopefully, the findings will serve as a glimpse into the nature of community college scholarship, in general.

How Theory Informs the Study

In a previous section, I dealt with the theoretical framework I used for my research, citing my employment of an interpretivist lens. In looking at theory in more specific terms, I offer a more in-depth discussion here.

I depended on the interpretive lens to assist me in providing a sense of the shared meanings the informants and I constructed during the study. I depended on the nature of qualitative design to allow me to glean insight and information emically, probing the informants to express the views that may have differed from the culturally reproduced notions inherent in the literature. In this sense, Giroux's (1981) explanation of cultural reproduction is useful: "cultural reproduction . . . represents the transmission of the culture of the dominant class . . . the cultural hegemony, or dominant form of cultural capital, consists of those attitudes, dispositions, tastes, linguistic competencies, and systems of meaning that the ruling-class deems as being legitimate" (p. 71). Because this theory does not allow for individual action, I looked to Bowers (1987) to refine the framework.

Bowers considers the nature of power in relation to language and culture. He says, "the relativizing of cultural traditions means that individuals and groups with greater skill in using (and manipulating) the language system will exercise power in naming and thus controlling how others will view social reality" (1987, p. 28). He calls this skill in language "communicative competence" and defines it as "the individual's ability to negotiate meanings

and purposes instead of passively accepting the social realities defined by others" (Bowers, 1987, p. 2). Communicative competence, says Bowers, "requires, beyond individual facility in speech situations, a knowledge of relevant issues and the conceptual frameworks that influence our way of thinking" (1987, p. 2). Once the cultural hegemony is questioned, once beliefs and constructs are "made explicit and examined in a critical manner, they lose their traditional hold on us," says Bowers (1987, p. 6). This ability of our society to allow for negotiation of ideology and meaning creates opportunity for our cultural reproduction to be halted or altered. Bowers explains that "as taken-for-granted beliefs are made explicit and are challenged, there is a moment in social and conceptual time when the individual experiences the temporary openness of liminal space . . . [at this time] new definitions can be presented, and the conceptual foundations of authority renegotiated" (1987, p. 6-7). The role of discourse, within this liminal space, is political, says Bowers; individuals who have communicative competence are presented with an opportunity to define reality on their terms. Such is my goal as a researcher. During my research, I attempted to create a liminal space for community college faculty, so they were able to express their communicative competence without the constraints of the dominant views of academe. Further evidence and explication of how these theories inform the study will be offered within the context of data analysis and presentation of findings.

Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted in the fall of 1998. It consisted of document review and individual interviews with two faculty members and one administrator at the same institution used for this case study. The research I conducted for the pilot study took me in a direction I had not anticipated; rather than give me data to explain who was engaged in scholarship and why, as I had expected, the informants took a different perspective on the issues in the case. The faculty members described the nature of *community college scholarship* as something often quite different from and less valued than traditional scholarship, and their discourse in interviews often included references to feelings of a lack of professional esteem and lack of respect and voice within academe. For these reasons, I did not neglect to consider how these issues may have affected the nature of my research for the dissertation. While much of what I found was, perhaps, typical of the current understanding of scholarship within academe, I have ensured that the instances where the data divert from the accepted definition are heard and reported.

The following text is an abridged version of the findings in the pilot study:

Definition of Community College Scholarship

The informants understand community college scholarship as being collaborative. Scholarship, at this institution, takes many different forms.

While an instructor might study trends and changes in his students and his teaching methods over the course of a year, most of the scholarly activities were described as more short-term than traditional scholarship that one might see occurring at universities. The majority of the scholarship was also seen as focused on teaching and learning, not on one's discipline. Informants struggled with the notion of redefining scholarship to fit what occurs here.

Importance of Community College Scholarship

In discussing the importance of community college scholarship, the consensus was that it would be "nirvana" if all faculty and staff would engage in scholarship, but that it is "absolutely critical" for faculty to do so. The informants felt that all faculty members had an obligation to engage in scholarly activities, most notably to stay current in their disciplines and in their teaching methodologies. Instructional administrators were seen as also needing to be engaged in scholarship but less so than faculty as they have less direct impact on instruction, it was posited.

Motivation

An especially interesting issue arose during these interviews while I was asking about what influenced community college administrators and faculty members to engage in scholarship; they all talked about themselves as learners when they were children. They saw their scholarly interests as being formed in early stages of their lives.

While the primary motivation for engaging in community college scholarship seems to be intrinsic and personal, there are external factors that motivate them to engage in scholarship. The informants feel encouraged, supported, and rewarded by their peers and their administrators at this institution. The awards and other forms of recognition were referred to often as positive motivators. They believe that scholarship should influence decisions of promotion and pay raises, and they believe that there should be institutional incentives to promote scholarship within the college.

Promoting Scholarship

The faculty see themselves as being at the forefront in modeling and revering scholarship at this institution. One informant sees the entire institution as moving toward a culture that is "trying to get people to focus on scholarship more." The two informants who are faculty members emphasized the important part played by the chief academic officer in "making it a priority to focus on learning and getting [others] to do that too," and they see this as a way of encouraging their scholarship.

Impediments

The pilot study revealed that key impediments to scholarship include low salaries that make it necessary for faculty to find additional employment, inadequate professional development funding, and the lack of a system that offers tenure and faculty rank as rewards for engaging in scholarly activities. All three of my informants in the pilot study expressed a sense of feeling

undervalued within higher education as the biggest limitation in their engaging in scholarship; they seemed to suggest that it is difficult to engage in the discussion when they have the sense that their opinions are not valued within higher education. They also agree that time constraints in terms of course loads, committee assignments, administrative duties, and family responsibilities keep them from pursuing as much scholarly activity as they would like.

The personal belief that the higher education discourse community sees them as second best is also an impediment for some community college faculty and administrators. One of the most strikingly honest responses to the question of what impedes community college scholarship is this: "The assumption [is] that [scholarship is] something that people do at the university but not at community college, [there exists within academe] the mistaken notion that we just train people and that that doesn't include scholarship. Wrapped up in that is lack of self-esteem, lack of encouragement from [others]."

Value of Scholarship

In the pilot study, informants saw scholarship's value in terms of its ability, ultimately, to have an effect on the students. The focus is on contributing to the community college discourse community at this institution and at statewide and national meetings and conferences. While they continually struggled with a clear definition of the term, improving the learning

experiences for students seemed to be the goal of their scholarship. While the informants acknowledge that the universities face their own set of problems, the community college faculty see their responsibilities as vastly different. One informant describes educators as having an ethical obligation to engage in scholarship. "If we keep on doing the same old thing," he says, "we are going to alienate a large portion of the population, and where are they going to go? If the community college can't change, that's a frightening prospect because there's nothing left." The community college may need its own understanding of and dedication to scholarship as a means of rethinking how it goes about educating its students. "In order to reach those students we have to change. That's the revolution I'm talking about. Revolution is a carefully chosen word; it means reconsidering everything we are doing," says this same informant.

The Social Nature of Community College Scholarship

A strong theme of bonding and collaboration among the faculty at this college is evident in the interviews with informants in the pilot study. Scholarship is seen as drawing people together; they look to their colleagues for discussion, critique, and collaboration. Communication links them together in their movement toward a common goal -- educating each other and their students.

Conclusions

While evidence of the university norm of scholarship as the production of text was found to exist at this institution, the primary means of engaging in community college scholarship appeared to be more social in nature and more immediate in result. One might argue that some community college scholars are engaged in what Bogdan and Biklen (1998) call "practitioner research." In this type of scholarship, "the investigator is often a practitioner . . . who wants to . . . do what he or she does better." They "do not necessarily write reports. They translate them immediately into practical changes" (p. 212). In this sense, community college scholars can be seen as social activists. Their discourse is largely underground in that it flows within their specialized community; it most often takes the form of oral dialogue or text in arenas such as email, listservs, and discussion forums on the Web. The majority of their discourse may not reach the larger higher education community and may not be accepted as scholarship within that community.

CHAPTER TWO: Review of the Literature

The History of Scholarship in the Community College

The role of community colleges throughout the past century has been to focus on offering pragmatic instruction, educating the masses, and providing equal access to higher education. In clearly differentiating itself from the four-year institutions, the community college did not include research in its mission. This, one may claim, led to its current position as "second best" (Zwerling, 1976) in the area of scholarship. However, current discourse within higher education suggests that attitudes and definitions about what constitutes scholarship are changing. In correlating the history and mission of the community college in terms of dedication to student learning and to quality instruction with the production of a new kind of scholarship, perhaps, a new opportunity for community college faculty appears.

Extension of High School

Community colleges, sometimes also called junior colleges or technical institutes, trace their roots in the United States to the mid-to-late 1800s. A research paper compiled by Kelly, Shamblin, and Whitaker (1998) noted that, in reviewing literature on the history of the two-year college movement, two major purposes for these institutions are clear -- neither of which is providing the higher education that is traditionally associated with the production of scholarship. The first purpose is that of providing an extension of high school or secondary studies in order to prepare students to enter university with two

years of college coursework completed. At the time this idea was originally proposed (in the mid-1800s), many universities bore the responsibility for preparing their own students in basic studies so that these students could then earn a baccalaureate degree in a specific area. Henry Tappan, president of the University of Michigan from 1825 to 1863, was one of the first to recommend the transfer of the first two years of college to secondary or high schools. Others who shared his ideas and wanted to separate the university from the necessity of non-university instruction included W.W. Folwell of the University of Minnesota, Edmund James of the University of Illinois, and William Rainey Harper, founder and first president of the University of Chicago (Monroe, 1972, p. 7-8). The words of these early university presidents and their peers demonstrate an elitist bias regarding the lower quality of education needed at the junior college level and the corresponding level of teaching necessary to provide this education. Richard Jesse, president of the University of Missouri, was quoted as saying in 1896 that the character of teaching was the same at the high school level and at the freshman and sophomore college levels (Monroe, 1972, p. 8). In addressing the National Education Association in 1900, Harper echoed these sentiments asserting that the work freshman and sophomore students are required to do is akin to the work they do in high school in both subject matter and methods. Using university methods, he further stated, is not useful until the end of the sophomore year (Monroe, 1972, p. 8).

Harper is often credited with the development of the movement that resulted in the community college. In 1892, Harper segregated the four-year institution at the University of Chicago into a lower (academic) and upper college. He coined the phrase "junior college" in 1895 and said that junior colleges could not only prepare students for the university but could also provide some college education to those who could not attend a four-year university as well as serve as a model for high schools wishing to expand their offerings (Wattenbarger and Witt, 1995, p. 17-18; Monroe, 1972). From Chicago, the concept of the junior college moved to Missouri, Michigan, and Indiana where other leaders shared Harper's condescending stance on the differences between grades one through fourteen and university study (Monroe, 1972). The turn of the century marks the opening of Joliet Junior College in Illinois (Segner, 1974; Vaughan, 1995). After 1910, California led the nation in the development of junior colleges. Then, in 1948, New York State passed what Bogue called "one of the most comprehensive laws ever enacted for the establishment of a state-wide system," and, according to Bogue, New York "was the first state to designate these institutions as community colleges" (1950, p. 79).

Expanding Educational Opportunities

Most historians agree that by the time the junior college movement spread to California the second main purpose of these colleges had become prominent -- that of expanding educational opportunities for higher education

to the general population (Frye, 1995). This expansion included providing educational access to poor youth and those living in rural areas (Ratcliff, 1995; Monroe, 1972; Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Alexis Lange, Dean of the School of Education of the University of California from 1906 to 1924, saw the junior college as helping to fulfill the goal of universal education; the junior college provided a way for young people to gain not only a general education but also a vocational one. In a 1917 address to a University of Chicago conference, Lange said, "Accordingly, the junior college, in order to promote the general welfare, which is the sole reason for its existence, cannot make preparation for the university its excuse for being. Its courses of instruction and training are to be culminal rather than basal" (quoted in Monroe, 1972, p. 11). The Jacksonian ideal of popular government for all people was applied to the system of education. The proposal of providing access to education was accepted and even funded in the state legislatures as the public junior college movement grew. By 1920, public junior colleges were found in eight states. Some state-supported technical institutes, normal schools, and agricultural colleges also later became community colleges (Monroe, 1972). However, in the early 1900s, the majority of junior college institutions were private rather than public, so access was still somewhat restricted. It was not until after World War II that the number of public community colleges began to outnumber private institutions and this second purpose, of expanding

educational opportunities for higher education to the general population, gained wide public acceptance (Monroe, 1972).

Community colleges became popular when Congress passed the GI Bill in 1946, providing funding for WWII veterans who wished to pursue an education; many returning soldiers looked to the community colleges as a means of training for the workforce. In 1947, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education echoed comments of earlier access advocates arguing that only informed, thoughtful, and tolerant people can create a free, democratic society. The road to such a society, the Commission argued, is built upon a system that offers educational opportunities to all its people (Monroe, 1972, p. 14). Accordingly, the Commission called for tuition-free education for a student's first two years of college (Hall, 1974). The commission believed that this action would make higher education available for all who desired to benefit from it. According to Vaughan (1995), the phrase "community college" was popularized by the Truman Commission; this, he says, caused hundreds of two-year colleges to include "community" in their names.

Initially, many public junior colleges in America served small communities where higher education was not available (Hall, 1974). After the President's Commission Report, it was decided that community colleges should also be placed in the cities. Tuition would be low or free and teachers would be responsible for teaching, not research. Counseling services would be made

available for students in an effort to help them make good decisions, and students who were undecided about their career directions could take the two years in the community college to explore options. Curricula leading to careers in technical areas were also developed. Additionally, voters decided that these community colleges should extend their hours, allowing working adults to attend evening classes if desired. The community college movement was clearly grass-roots; it grew out of the needs of the people. It was "a people's educational movement" (Bogue, 1950, p. 90).

Widespread Growth of the Community College

The ideals associated with community colleges became so popular that during the 1950's and 1960's forty to sixty community colleges were opened each year. In 1960, Miami opened a community college designed for 1,300 students and 3,000 enrolled. Between 1960 and 1969, the number of students and the number of two-year colleges doubled (Monroe, 1972). Although it has been said that North Carolina was slow to jump on the community college bandwagon (see Segner,1974), eventually, North Carolina led the South in community college growth and today is the second largest system in the United States with fifty-eight community college institutions statewide.

One result of all of this growth was that the community colleges found themselves becoming "all things to all people" who wanted to be educated beyond high school. In 1973, Kintzer commended community colleges for

the strides they were making in articulation agreements and student readiness, enabling students to transfer into the universities; "community colleges . . . have in general proved their worth; the quality of such preparation should be widely recognized" (p. 16). In addition to serving those who wanted to prepare for the university, community colleges were now serving those who wanted terminal technical degrees, those who wanted evening classes, those who wanted subject-specific coursework, and those who wanted English language instruction.

By the 1970s, the "Cinderalla" period for the community colleges was over. The typical urban community college reported annual student drop-out rates at near 50%. Approximately 75% of the low achievers failed to complete their first years. These and other problems fueled taxpayers' concerns about accountability and caused many to question the mission of the community colleges (Hall, 1974). In 1968, Devall wrote an article criticizing the community colleges for trying to perform too many functions and not doing any of them well. The article presented the argument that the niche community colleges were trying to fill could be "handled more rationally and effectively by other organizations in the society without resorting to the expansion of this bugaboo in American education" (p. 168). Those other organizations are, one might note, serving students in concert with community colleges to this day; they are proprietary schools, companies, the military, university extension divisions, and what Devall called "universities in the field"

(1968, p. 169). In 1970, Jennings supported Devall's view and proffered the idea that in its attempt to serve the masses, "[the community college] assumes an anti-intellectual leveling stance that inevitably will produce a new kind of second-class citizenship" (p. 21).

Community College Instruction Comes Under Attack

In the late 1960s and the early 1970s, the community college system began to have significant problems and came under scrutiny. This pessimism extended to the area of teaching quality and teacher training in community colleges. Jennings (1970) demanded that community college faculty "should not be permitted to reject all research in favor of an exclusively instructional role"; rather, they should be "encouraged to invent what might be called a moral equivalent of research," which would be in concert with the "announced community role these institutions wish to assume" (p. 21). In 1968, Jencks and Riesman likened teachers at community colleges to four-year college teachers who "continue to teach what they were taught in four-year colleges, immunized from new ideas, both by isolation and by the prestige of the models they are emulating" (p. 488). These two authors stated that they doubted that any significant innovations in academic theory or practice would arise from the community college movement (Jencks and Riesman, 1968). The fact that these sentiments so closely echoed the ideas of the early university presidents from the 1800s indicates how the public community-junior college has been regarded since its inception. Clearly this type of

institution has not been seen as one where academic excellence and scholarship are promoted and thrive. As Jennings (1970) describes it, a junior or community college was planned to "be preeminently a teaching institution, having none of the custodial impulses or responsibilities of the secondary schools, and very little of the discipline-centered research commitments of the university" (p. 25). "The community junior college," claimed Jennings, "is primarily, even exclusively, a teaching institution. It seeks . . . to recruit [faculty] who want first and foremost to teach, to instruct, to facilitate learning, to make discovery happen, who do not want . . . to 'commit research'. They want engagement" (1970, p. 17).

William Rainey Harper was one of the first to require that professors at four-year universities conduct research in order to be promoted in their jobs (Rudolph, 1990). However, since the inception of the community college, no such requirement has been placed on faculty members at community colleges. In contrast, according to Frye, as universities redefined their roles in society and "research, publications and activities in professional associations became standards of achievement for professors," teaching -- especially teaching undergraduates, has come to be viewed as an "impediment to achievement in those areas that bring status and income" to educational institutions (Frye, 1992, p. 45). But Boyer found evidence of some level of cognitive dissonance among university faculty. He reported that "a considerable gap exists between the reward structures of the profession and the preferences of

professors . . . over half of the faculty at all types of institutions agreed that "teaching effectiveness, not publication, should be the primary criterion for promotion" (1987, p. 128).

The Present and Future of Community College Scholarship

Currently, community college faculty are seen "as neither challenged enough nor challenging to their students in the endeavor of higher learning" (Marshood, 1995, p. 51). There has been, since the 1980's, however, a movement within the higher education discourse community to redefine its terminology in such a way that community college faculty and administrators can work within the existing mission of their institutions, understanding it as supportive of, perhaps even premised on, the pursuit, maintenance, and promotion of scholarship. In an effort to facilitate this, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) linked scholarship closely to the work of community college faculty, calling for the use of classrooms as laboratories to feed scholarship, and Boyer (1990) opened up the definition of the word scholarship even further, suggesting that teaching itself be considered a form of scholarship. But such definitions challenge the accepted research-based understanding of scholarship and create a dichotomous relationship between the two terms, research and scholarship. One definition of scholarship that has been widely accepted in current literature seems to be the definition proposed by Vaughan in 1988:

> scholarship is the umbrella under which research falls, for research is but one form of scholarship. Scholarship results in a product that is shared with others and that is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product . . . Scholarship requires that one have a solid foundation in one's professional field and that one keep up with the developments in that field (p. 27).

Understanding scholarship in this way disarms critics who are caught in the debate over whether community college faculty should engage in research. Clearly, this is not the point. As Vaughan (1991) points out, "community college faculty and administrators need to change their existing attitudes toward scholarship and to view it from the perspective of the community college mission" (p. 3). Furthermore, they must "redefine [their roles] in ways that are in concert with the community college mission" (p. 5).

Ernest Boyer and George Vaughan have both debated issues surrounding the definition of scholarship in higher education. While they focus their attention in different settings within the higher education community, their views on scholarship are quite similar.

Boyer (1990 & 1997) called for a new understanding of scholarship in terms of the university professor's responsibility to service, for meeting the practical needs of society. He defined scholarship as engagement, which requires the professor to engage in four functions of scholarship: discovery,

integration, sharing knowledge, and applying knowledge. His insistence on practicality, on serviceability, focused attention on scholarship as more than research, which had been the accepted understanding of the term at the time (and perhaps in many circles remains so). His presentation of sharing knowledge as more than research and publication opened up the definition to include teaching as a valid expression of scholarship; scholars must teach students as a means of keeping scholarship alive, he argued; teaching sustains scholarship.

One might note that Boyer's insistence on service and meeting the needs of society fits nicely within the current mission of community colleges. His perspective can be seen in the historical context in which community colleges were founded. Created as teaching institutions that focused on educating the masses, community colleges do not include research in their mission; therefore, the accepted view of scholarship as research-based does not apply. Understanding scholarship in the manner that Boyer suggested, though, gives highly warranted credibility to the work being done in community colleges. Vaughan's attention is focused here. He sees the community college as the appropriate setting for identifying and meeting the practical needs of society. The community college's mission is built on the provision of service. But, as Vaughan laments, the type of scholarship that occurs within the community college, because it is not produced or presented in the traditional fashion, is undervalued. Vaughan looks at factors

contributing to this limited view of scholarship, including faculty attitudes and administrative support. He calls for a new perspective, one that understands scholarship as integral to the community college mission (see Vaughan, 1988 & 1991).

Both Boyer and Vaughan suggest that the primary means of changing the existing attitudes toward an understanding of scholarship lies is the creation of a new system of rewards for scholars in all of higher education. University professors need to be encouraged to teach, to sustain scholarship; community college professionals need to be encouraged to participate in professional development and renewal activities and to join the discourse community in higher education.

It is impossible to provide quality education without continuous education and inquiry on the part of the educator. Faculty who do not engage in scholarship and administrators who do not both engage in and support scholarship are, indeed, considered second best within the higher education community (see Boyer, 1987). They are neglecting, as Vaughan might put it, their responsibilities to their jobs and to the profession. Scholarship is seen as the key to academic integrity and accountability. In the ideal higher education setting, students should demand it, colleagues should encourage it, and institutions should reward it. In 1984, Vaughan stated that the committee members at a meeting of the President's Academy felt the most important issue facing the community college involved keeping faculty and

administrators up to date with new technologies, and more importantly, maintaining vitality in the community college.

The Current Reality, According to the Literature

Unfortunately, a review of the literature on this subject reveals a perception that scholarship is not demanded, encouraged, or rewarded in most community college settings (see Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993; Vaughan, 1991). The reality presented is that the majority of community college students are interested primarily in obtaining credentials to help them qualify for a job or promotion, to upgrade their skills, or to transfer to a university. Few students demand that their instructors be scholars. Some faculty members fear that their job security and their opportunities for promotion might be in jeopardy if scholarship is tied to the evaluation process in community colleges. Other colleagues argue against what they fear might add to their already overloaded responsibilities. Though many community college faculty members value scholarship, few of them engage in it, and those who do report that they do so simply because they have a personal commitment to their profession (Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993, p. 35; Vaughan, 1991). Perhaps the core of the problem is that community colleges do not have a system of rewards to promote scholarship. Community college faculty members and administrators have little incentive to pursue original scholarship (whatever its definition), and there is often little assistance for those who choose to. In fact, faculty members have reported being reprimanded for

engaging in scholarly pursuits during working hours; there is "evidence that the culture of the community college is not only unconducive to scholarship but also, on some campuses, even hostile to it" (Vaughan, 1991, p. 7).

Perhaps it is through the redefinition of scholarship and an understanding of it in relation to the mission of providing quality instruction that community colleges -- the students, faculty, and administrators -- will come to see scholarship as a means of preventing "burnout and help[ing to] ensure that the teacher's love of learning is conveyed to students" (Palmer,1991, p. 72). As Palmer submits, "scholarship must be attended to or it will be overshadowed by day-to-day college operations and pushed aside by those who do not understand the nature of scholarship and its connection to the community college mission" (1991, p. 69).

A Turning Point?

In 1991, Vaughan stated that "it seems as if the community college may be at a turning point in its attitude toward scholarship" (p.10). Although it has proved to be a slow process, the turning point appears to have reached its zenith. The Eighth American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards, held February 3-6, 2000, was titled "Scholarship Reconsidered Reconsidered." Its focus was on promoting Boyer's definition of scholarship, outlined in his 1990 work, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. This work, and its follow-up book titled Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate, authored by Glassick, et

al., was sponsored by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Through its new CASTL Program (Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning), using venues offered by professional organizations such as AAHE, and through the scholarship of its president, Lee Shulman, and other staff, the Carnegie Foundation is leading the higher education discourse community toward a revolution in its understanding of the nature of scholarship. As Shulman argued in a speech given at the AAHE conference in February 2000, what makes an activity scholarship is that it moves beyond the innate human capacity to count and name . . . we recount, rename, reflect, teach. The act of reflecting on what we've done, he said, is a fundamental factor in being able to do it well. He further argued that "teaching is the occasion for pulling together all the other scholarships," that " teaching is the role we play in which we do integrative work." "If teaching is not engagement" he said, "I don't know what is." In this remark, he argued that teaching is related to Boyer's call for a Scholarship of Teaching and of Engagement. Finally, Shulman argued that we should view teaching as the means of transmitting knowledge to the next generation. The definition of the Scholarship of Teaching espoused by Shulman and the Carnegie Teaching Academy Campus Program is this:

> The scholarship of teaching is problem posing about an issue of teaching or learning, study of the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies, application of results

to practice, communication of results, self-reflection, and peer review (p. 11).

Hutchings and Shulman (1999) explain that the scholarship of teaching has three main features, as they see it: it is public (i.e. community property), "open to critique and evaluation, and in a form that others can build on." They add another attribute, too: "it involves question-asking, inquiry and investigation, particularly around issues of student learning." "A scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching;" they argue, "it requires faculty to frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning" (p. 13).

Scholarship among community college professionals continues to be a topic of debate and of concern; community college faculty members are still trying to determine the hows and whys of valuing scholarship at their institutions. Studies report information on many aspects of the debate, including how scholarship affects the vitality of faculty (Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993) and how community college administrators regard faculty scholarship (Marshood, 1995). In stark contrast with Boyer's positive stand, Cohen and Brawer (1996) imply that applied knowledge and scholarship is not valuable; they assert that community college faculty seldom engage in scholarship, and, they add in a negative tone, when they do publish, the content is classroom-related and specific to their institutions. Safarik and Getskow (1997) agree that community college faculty suffer from a lack of professionalism in part

due to the nature of the scholarship they produce; however, they do admit that "although many practitioners write in isolation and do not connect their writing to broad educational research themes, they do have the advantage of an 'insider view' of the community college not available to other researchers" (p. 72).

But understanding teaching as a form of scholarship creates new opportunities and builds a bridge for community college faculty through which they can join in the academic discourse in a new way. Once academe legitimates the scholarship of teaching, community college faculty may see it as a more intentional form of what they do every day; perhaps then they will view it as integral to their profession.

The key to its legitimatization is in its assessment. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) completed Boyer's work regarding scholarship when they offered standards by which scholarly work, including the scholarship of teaching, should be judged. They submit these six requirements: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique (p. 36). These standards are in concert with the assertions and discussions offered in current literature regarding research in the classroom (Cross and Steadman, 1996; Mohr, 1996).

Eisner and Peshkin (1990) point out a potential problem facing proponents of the teachers-as-scholars paradigm. They assert that "practitioners . . . seldom read educational research, and they often feel

incompetent to judge its adequacy. For most practitioners in our experience, most conventional research is thought to be remote from practice, except, perhaps, when its conclusions confirm or support what they already believe" (p. 173). Perhaps the operative word there is conventional; when faculty see scholarship as an outgrowth of teaching, perhaps they will not feel inadequate to judge its worth. Another stumbling block exists for faculty who wish to engage in the scholarship of teaching, says Shulman (1999). He asks, "where is the scholarly literature through which higher educators study exemplars of teaching and can build upon that work? With few exceptions," he answers, "we don't have such a literature" (p. 16). Perhaps with growing interest and enthusiasm, more educators will begin to look to the early work of Patricia Cross and others to guide them in conducting classroom research. As Cross and Steadman (1996) argued, there is a "need to develop a teaching community . . . [where faculty can] come together in thoughtful conversations about teaching" (p. xv). They noted that their hope was that their book "will heighten the intellectual challenge of teaching, serving teachers as a tool to implement the scholarship of teaching" (p. xix). Mohr (1996) offered these predictions about the future of teacher research:

> Teachers . . .will be conducting research and presenting their ideas to their colleagues. Teacher-researchers will contribute to new definitions of what it means to teach. Teacher research will contribute to the knowledge base of the profession, and teacher

> researchers will participate as equal partners in the discourse of the profession. Teacher research . . . will reshape the understanding of how [students] learn and will transform our schools into learning communities (p. 117-121).

Because these attitudes are changing, community college scholarship is a topic worthy of continued probing and discussion within the higher education community. Vaughan states that in order for community colleges to remain an important force in higher education, they must continue to have open access and comprehensiveness, but the future also demands faculty and administrative vitality which may be gained through scholarship. As Boyer (1987) argued, "while not all [faculty members] are or should be publishing researchers, they, nonetheless, should be first rate scholars." What he means by this is that faculty should stay "abreast of the profession," should know the literature in their disciplines, and should skillfully communicate information to students. "To weaken faculty scholarship," he warns, "is to undermine the undergraduate experience, regardless of the academic setting" (p. 131).

Review of the Literature Regarding Interpretivism as a Theoretical Frame for Case Study Research

Among the social sciences and the humanities, a shift in epistemology has occurred (Howe, 1998). This shift moved the emphasis away from positivism, toward interpretivism. The current emphasis is "on the cultural embeddedness of human identities and interests and on including hitherto

marginalized or excluded voices in our various conversations" (Howe, 1998, p. 13). This emphasis can be seen as aligned with a shift toward valuing qualitative research.

Researchers are less interested in demanding or in promising objectivity in their work; they see value in their subjective stance as researchers, as partners in their studies. "The interpretivist inquiry framework acknowledges and legitimizes the presence of self in inquiry; all interpretivist studies are colored by the substantive, political, and value predispositions of the inquirer" (Greene, 1993, p. 35). The goal of interpretive inquiry is to understand the nature of the participants' perceived realities and to be cognizant of one's role as researcher, including how one's own understanding of the world may influence the study. As Schwandt (1996) puts it, "serious reflection on the nature and purpose of interpretive inquiry raises questions of our being; it requires each of us to come to terms with a union of moral and cognitive concerns in our own and others' lived experience" (p. 84).

In their discussion of obstacles that block the acceptance of qualitative research in the United Kingdom, Peck and Secker (1999) offer interpretivism as the key to establishing quality criteria for qualitative research within their context of health care research. They describe the main tenet of interpretivism in this manner: The researcher interprets everything he or she observes through a "mesh of understanding woven from previous experiences and interpretations of information from other people and sources." The

implications of this include an aim of exploring how participants understand the topics and issues under study, and an outcome of theories that are inevitably the researcher's interpretations of participants' understandings, not just a reflection of them (p. 4).

Denzin and Lincoln (1998) argue that "all research is interpretive, guided by a set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood and studied. Some of these beliefs may be taken for granted," they say; "others are highly problematic and controversial. However, each interpretive paradigm makes particular demands on the researcher, including the questions that are asked and the interpretations that are brought to them" (p. 26). These authors then identify constructivist-interpretivist as one of the four main research paradigms. The constructivist-interpretive paradigm, they say, "assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjectivist epistemology (knower and subject create understandings), and a naturalistic set of methodological procedures" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1999, p. 27).

The Roots of Interpretivism

Although Denzin and Lincoln (1998) link constructivism and interpretivism together, Schwandt (1998) prefers to look at them as somewhat unique in terms of the purpose and aim of the inquiry and how they conceptualize matters of knowing and being. Schwandt agrees that both "persuasions share the goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it." "This goal," he says,

"is an abiding concern for the life world, for the emic point of view, for understanding meaning, for grasping the actor's definition of a situation, for *Verstehen*" (p. 221).

Researchers (Blasi, Dasilva, and Wiegert, 1978; Neuman,1994; Pressler and Dasilva, 1996) attribute the genesis of interpretive social science to the German sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920). Weber said that sociologists should study social action. Weber's emphasis on purposeful social action and on empathetic understanding, his idea of *Verstehen*, illustrated his interest in how people feel and create meaning. Neuman (1994) also relates interpretivism to *hermeneutics*, which emphasizes the "examination of text, which could refer to a conversation, written words, or pictures . . . to discover embedded meaning. The theory says that people carry their subjective experience to a text" (p. 61).

In separating interpretivism from constructivism, Schwandt traces the roots of interpretivism to Clifford Geertz's interpretive anthropology, Herbert Blumer and G. H. Mead's version of symbolic interactionism, and Norman Denzin's perspective on interpretive interactionism.

Henstrand helps us understand the work of the interpretive anthropologist as the theory of and practice of studying culture. "Interpretive anthropologists study individuals or institutions or both. The only reality [they] claim is that of their own interpretation of what they are describing" (1993, p. 90). Within the literature, anthropologist Clifford Geertz is widely

noted as a key interpretivist. Geertz is, perhaps, best known for his 1973 book, The Interpretation of Cultures and 1983 book, Local Knowledge. In the former, Geertz offers this explanation of his interpretive paradigm:

> The concept of culture I espouse . . . is essentially a semiotic one. Believing . . . that a man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning. It is explication I am after, construing social expressions on their surface enigmatical. (p. 5)

In his 1983 work, Geertz submits that, in the final analysis, the interpretive study of culture is meant to understand the diverse ways people "construct their lives in the act of leading them." He cautions the interpretive researcher to "steer between overinterpretation and underinterpretation, reading more into things than reason permits and less into them that it demands" (p. 16). His message seems clear in this passage:

> . . . it is from the . . . difficult achievement of seeing ourselves amongst others, as a local example of the forms human life has locally taken, a case among cases, a world among worlds, that the largeness of mind, without which objectivity is self-congratulation and tolerance a sham, comes. If interpretive

anthropology has any general office in the world it is to keep reteaching this fugitive truth. (p. 16)

In 1989, Denzin offered a perspective he termed *interpretive interactionism*. This perspective, he says, was his "attempt to make the world of problematic lived experience of ordinary people directly available to the reader" (p. 7). He offered this approach as a means of combining many other perspectives such as symbolic interactionism, ethnography, semiotics, fieldwork, naturalistic studies, creative interviewing, case study research, and more.

Schwandt (1998) also locates the genesis of interpretivism within "the German intellectual tradition of hermeneutics and the *Verstehen* tradition in sociology." At the start, interpretivists "argued for the uniqueness of human inquiry, separating what they called the mental or cultural sciences from the natural sciences. The goal of these new sciences is understanding the meaning of social events (p. 223). Because meaning is their primary focus, interpretivists center on the processes by which "meanings are created, negotiated, sustained, and modified within a specific context of human action" (p. 225).

Interpretivism and Case Study Research

A review of the literature regarding interpretivism as a theoretical frame establishes that interpretivism has become virtually synonymous with qualitative research (see Flinders & Mills, 1993; Heshusius & Ballard, 1996).

Although focusing her comments specifically on program evaluation, Greene's comments are helpful in understanding the natural symmetry between interpretivism and qualitative work. She notes,

> Guided by the philosophical tenets of interpretivism, qualitative [researchers] expect a plurality of program experiences and hence diversity in the meanings constructed from these experiences. The nature and form of this diversity can be neither known in advance nor meaningfully explained by perspectives external to the context, but rather emerge from the [researcher's] engagement with those who experience the program firsthand. Hence, the a priori adoption of a conceptual framework that prescribes the substantive direction of [a study], as suggested by the theory-driven approach, is antithetical to qualitative [research]. (1993, p. 32)

Certainly, an interpretive paradigm can be employed, regardless of the methods used to conduct the qualitative study. However, interpretivism seems especially appropriate for case study research. According to Marshall and Rossman (1999), case studies focus on "society and culture;" this type of strategy "entails immersion in the setting and rests on both the researcher's and the participants' worldviews" (p. 61). This strategy aligns nicely with the tenets of interpretivism. Denzin and Lincoln (1998) identify constructivist-interpretive as one of the four major paradigms for qualitative research; in

doing so, it is interesting to note that this is the only paradigm for which they list case study as a key form of narration. As Guba (1996) argues, "research must be decentralized to the local context [and] research must be carried out cooperatively; that is, [it should be conducted] with the full consent and involvement of the persons affected in any way by the outcomes" (p. 127). Conducting a case study using an interpretive theoretical frame allows for this to happen naturally; it, in fact, prescribes that it must occur.

Merriam (1998) offers what she calls the "most helpful typology" of the basic forms of research: positivist, interpretive, and critical. The interpretive form, as I see it, is preferable for qualitative research, for the others can be seen as inherently flawed from a qualitative standpoint. First, the positivist notion that reality is constant and measurable, that it is stable and observable, is aligned with a quantitative paradigm. As Donmoyer argues, "it is impossible to talk of the nature of reality with any sense of certainty because we can never know reality independent of the cognitive structures that influence our perceptions" (p. 181). Furthermore, using a critical stance forces the researcher to look for indications of inequity, cultural reproduction, and oppression within the case; the danger here is finding these indications while becoming blinded to other potential interpretations. Because case study research requires that the researcher gain, as Merriam (1998) says, "an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved . . . in a bounded system," an interpretive lens is appropriate (p.19). The interpretive

lens levels the field, protecting against the theory becoming the overriding factor in generating findings in the study.

There are many different kinds of case studies a researcher has to choose from (Bogden & Biklen, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1993; Yin, 1994). And, as Yin (1993) argues, case study research can be conducted in both a quantitative and qualitative manner. But the qualitative researcher, regardless of the type of case study conducted, must play one central role -- that of interpreter and gatherer of interpretations. How the qualitative researcher goes about this depends on his or her notions of reality and knowledge. I agree with Stake, that, in case study research, the aim "is not to discover [an external reality], for that is impossible, but to construct a clearer [experiential reality] and a more sophisticated [rational reality (i.e. integrated interpretations)]" (1995, p. 100-101). The case study researcher must clarify descriptions and interpret interpretations; a constructivist-interpretivist view, says Stake (1995), "encourages providing readers with good raw material for their own generalizing. The emphasis is on [thick] description" (p. 102). The qualitative case study researcher must attempt to "preserve the multiple realities" present in the case, even as they appear contradictory (Stake, 1995, p. 12). In qualitative case studies, constant interpretation on the part of the researcher is fundamental.

While interpretive research is valuable for a variety of research designs, it is especially so for case study research. An interpretive lens calls for

collaboration between the researcher and the participants, allowing the interpretations of meaning to emphasize language and discourse and looking to semantic description as evidence (see LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Using interpretivism as a theoretical frame for case study research is certainly appropriate; it may even be imperative.

The Community College as a Discourse Community within the Larger Discourse Community of Higher Education

The community college can be understood as a discourse community within the larger discourse community of higher education. While the literature offers evidence that the definition of the term discourse community has been greatly debated, I begin with a tentative definition offered by Bizzell (1992) in that it seems comprehensive in its scope. A discourse community, she says, "is a group of people who share certain language-using practices . . . [that] can be seen as conventionalized" by social interactions within the group and in its dealings with outsiders. It borrows from the concept of "speech community." It is "bound together primarily by its uses of language, although bound perhaps by other ties as well, geographical, socioeconomic, ethnic, professional, and so on" (p. 222).

First and foremost, the community college is a speech community. Kutz (1997) defines speech communities in terms of the words that are used, the ways they are pronounced, the sorts of subjects talked about, who gets to ask and answer questions, what is stated explicitly, and what implications

might be understood. She applies the term speech community to professional communities "that carry on their conversations in writing," but she notes that "the more inclusive term discourse community, covering both spoken and written discourse, is usually used to refer to such contexts" (p. 24).

Social Constructionism and Discourse Community

The community college is a discourse community. Its members have, over time, developed a common discourse that involves shared knowledge, common purposes, common relationships, similar attitudes and values, shared understandings about how to communicate their knowledge and achieve their shared purposes, and a flow of discourse that has a particular structure and style (see Kutz, 1997, p. 200). Understanding discourse in this way has been described as aligned with a social constructionist perspective; as Bruffee (1986) explains, this "assumes that entities we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, selves, and so on are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers. Social construction understands [these things] as community-generated and community-maintained linguistic entities" (p. 774). As Giroux (1983) puts it, language is a social event that is defined, shaped, and constrained by the culture of the setting in which it is used.

Because the concept of a discourse community is aligned with the rhetoric of scholars who "advocate social constructionism or lean toward it -- [scholars such as] Kenneth Bruffee, Stanley Fish, Greg Myers, John Trimbur, David Bartholomae, and Karen Burke LeFevre," it has come under attack

(Kent, 1991, p. 441). Kent (1991, 1992) argues against social constructionism, and, hence, the very idea of a discourse community. The idea that our understanding of the world is relative to a discourse community, he believes, produces more problems than it solves. In response to Kent's argument, Schiappa (1992) submits that "Kent's treatment . . . [does not] adequately refute" social constructionism, and that, further, much of Kent's argument is in concert with the very idea of a discourse community (p. 522-523).

Communicative Competence

The community college discourse community can be seen as somewhat disenfranchised within its larger discourse community -- higher education. Bizzell (1982, 1992) writes about academic disciplines as separate discourse communities [noted elsewhere as disciplinary communities (see Kent, 1991)] and the university as a discourse community, defining the accepted conventions for academe. It is here, among members of the university discourse community, that the real communicative competence abides. Participating in the discourse of their disciplines and of higher education in general is an expectation of their culture; it is part of the "conceptual scheme" of the discourse community. This particular conceptual scheme may not be a part of the community college discourse community; perhaps this is a contributing factor in the current view that community colleges are a sort of stepchild of academe. In this sense, community colleges are, as argued by

Zwerling (1976) "second best" in terms of their communicative competence within higher education. Communicative competence is described as what one must know in order to use language appropriately in particular discourse communities (Kutz, 1997, p. 18). To put it another way, communicative competence is related to the idea that "individuals and groups with greater skill in using (and manipulating) the language system will exercise power in naming and thus controlling how others will view social reality" (Bowers, 1987, p. 28).

Boundaries

Discourse communities have fuzzy boundaries (Porter, 1992; Rafoth, 1988). They "may operate like little ecosystems," says Porter. These ecosystems "inevitably interact with systems abutting them. Discourse communities cannot be isolated from other discourse communities." "We need to remember that discourse communities overlap -- and are flexible and locally constituted." They may cross boundaries (1992, p. 86). Rafoth (1988) puts it this way: "Communities have fuzzy boundaries that allow for a good deal of overlap . . .The same may certainly be said of discourse communities. Human beings, such as they are, have multiple allegiances that overlap and conflict, and human discourse reflects this overlap and conflict all too well" (p. 143). My perception is that the community college discourse community exists both within and apart from the higher education discourse community. Community colleges have institutional missions that differ somewhat from

those of universities and four-year colleges; their student body is comprised largely of what is termed nontraditional and at-risk from the university perspective. The organizational structure, faculty roles, and systems for promotion and tenure (if any) are vastly different from those of research universities; the culture of the community college discourse community does not include an expectation of faculty scholarship.

From its position within the higher education discourse community, the community college adopts language given meaning within the larger community. The term nontraditional -- a term used widely within the both discourse communities -- exemplifies the reality that the communicative competence within academe belongs to the university discourse community. Students who are deemed "nontraditional" at the university are, on the contrary, traditional students in the community college setting. But even within the community college discourse, the term nontraditional is used to describe the students. On the other hand, from its position apart from the higher education discourse community, terms like open door take on meaning specific to the community college discourse community. Having an open door is a cultural statement about the mission of community colleges; they are open to community members who want access to postsecondary education.

Power and Influence in a Discourse Community

Clark's (1994) worries regarding the political assumptions that underlie the rhetoric of the field of composition studies (i.e. the composition studies

discourse community) are relevant to many other discourse communities, including higher education, its many disciplines, and community-junior colleges. That is, the rhetoric "assumes that [the members of a discourse community] are more or less equal politically, that they have equal access to and equal influence upon the discourse that determines the beliefs and purposes they will share." But, in fact, these communities "tend to minimize or exclude the participation of some people as they establish the dominance of others" (Clark, 1994, p. 61). A strength of discourse communities, as described by Rafoth (1988), is they admit writers, readers, and texts all together. But the readers play a passive role in this triad. It is the writers, and at time the texts, that hold the real power.

The power of university faculty and administrators to name "what is" comes largely from their ability to be prolific with their writing. Opportunities to share their knowledge, to create policy, to redefine the language and reality of higher education abound; engaging in scholarship is a well-developed aspect of the culture of this discourse community. The power to name "what is" comes also from one's level of prestige within the community. Zito (1984) argues that "an author is granted a certain binding authority to his intended meaning; this is legitimated by academic credentials, professional associations, and the division of knowledge within the academy" (p. 89). Furthermore, within a discourse community, "only those qualified by some socially institutionalized agency may engage in such discourse and be taken

seriously." "The academic 'turf,'" says Zito, is "a battleground for the right to speak with authority" (Zito, 1984, p. 89).

In discussing the work of Foucault, Zito (1984) outlines three main constraints on discourse: traditional texts that are vested with high authority and still continue to exert their influences by repetition and reiteration within the discourse community, the academic discipline working to legitimate its own author identities, and the qualifications of the speaker. "Only the ordained may employ the ritualistic speech of their discourse and expect to be taken seriously," he says (p. 91-92). The lack of opportunity and avenues for scholarship (and, of course an institutional culture that supports it) and the lack of legitimate power within the larger discourse community fight against the community college faculty member's ability to be heard. "From a critical standpoint," says Rafoth (1990), "discourse community goes beyond the identification of various sets of norms and their degrees of isolation and overlap. The broader, explanatory significance is to show how language operates to define one's identity, to maintain the divisions of social class, to constrain access to power, and even . . . to shape personal consciousness" (p. 147).

In seeing itself merely a part of the discourse community of higher education, the community college faculty members have little legitimate power and limited communicative competence; they are often relegated to the role of reader within this community, while others take on the role of writer. But

within their own discourse community, they have more individual "ability to negotiate meanings and purposes instead of passively accepting the social realities defined by others" (Bowers, 1987, p. 2).

At present, one might argue that community colleges can be more accurately defined as a speech community rather than as a discourse community because they do not produce much in the way of written discourse. But I prefer to see the boundaries as dotted lines, not barriers to community college faculty developing their communicative competence outside their discourse community. As Porter (1992) cautions, these boundaries "are not fixed or real; they are rhetorical constructs." "We cannot accept the divisions as given or assume them as a foundation because to do so would be to miss the essential framework on which the [discourse] community is based" (p. 91). We can see discourse communities as "living creatures, nurtured and nourished by rhetorical discourse" (Hogan, 1998, p. 292). At the same time, we are cautioned by the reality that "the community-building function of rhetoric often works as much by exclusion as by inclusion" (Hogan, 1998, p. 62).

CHAPTER THREE: Methodology

Qualitative Research as Chosen Methodology

My choice of a qualitative approach is in line with my personal worldview and the best choice, given my use of an interpretive lens for this study. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) agree that "qualitative methods are generally supported by the interpretivist paradigm, which portrays a world in which reality is socially constructed, complex, and everchanging" (p. 6). I am especially drawn to qualitative research in that I believe that it is the most logical and available method for conducting research within the community college; it allows me to conduct my research as an insider and to delve into the issues in the case emically. It also allows me to make sense of the data collaboratively. As Glesne and Peshkin (1994) point out, "much potential lies in the concept of practitioners as researchers who investigate . . . who couple basic research theories and techniques with an action-oriented alternative mode" (p. 12).

Sampling Procedure and Justification

Roman and Apple (1990) see the culture of an educational institution as the result of its history; they see institutions as "places that were and are formed out of cultural, political, and economic conflicts and compromises" (p. 41). My decision to study an institution within the community college system in this particular state is related to its historical background; it was an outgrowth of technical institutes and began with the primary mission of

providing technical and vocational training for individuals who opted to learn a trade rather than pursue a liberal education within the state's university system (Nagy, 1999, p. 7-9). This genesis differs from that of many states, whose community colleges were mirrored after their four-year institutions, some even adopting the title of junior college and emphasizing university transfer as a clear objective for their students. The community college used in this study now offers university transfer programs and is currently improving the articulation agreements with universities to make the transition from community college to university a smoother process for students; however, the primary focus at the community college is still on providing technical and vocational training and education. This community college (and others in this state) is also unique among community colleges in that the faculty members have no union, they teach on one-year contracts, and they have one rank (all have the status of "instructor," regardless of whether they have earned terminal degrees). Its history and organizational structure differ from the typical university and many community colleges.

I have chosen this particular site for the case study for a variety of reasons. First, the faculty here recently created a faculty council and have become more and more involved and empowered within the institution and within the state. While there are six other colleges that retain the term technical as part of their names, most of them are not situated so closely to so many four-year institutions, as is the subject of this study.

Furthermore, interviewing as an outsider who may not understand the nuances of the bounded system would be a detriment. As a member of the faculty at the college where I conducted the study, I have had access to the institution and the faculty and am involved in the discourse within this bounded system--a discourse that exists as a result of the active network of sharing and creation of what the informants in the pilot study offered as an oral form of scholarship. As an insider, I know who the potential key informants are and already have mutual trust and rapport with many of them. An additional consideration in this choice is that the chief instructional officer and the faculty are heading a campus-wide initiative focusing on teaching and learning; this new initiative may have a lasting impact on community college scholarship here. There is a new Teaching and Learning Center in its development phase here. Its mission states that the "TLC is dedicated to enhancing teaching and learning excellence for faculty, students, and staff" at the college. Its goals include encouraging, offering, and sponsoring professional development activities that enhance teaching and learning, encouraging faculty to explore the use of new technology and methods for assessing learning, showcasing the achievement of outstanding educational initiatives, and encouraging funding of faculty and staff projects aimed at enhancing teaching and learning.

I interviewed a faculty member who was an instrumental informant in my pilot study again by inviting her to participate in the focus group which

included seven faculty members mentioned in interviews conducted during the pilot study or included to ensure representation from most academic departments (one informant declined inclusion in the focus group at the last minute due to time constraints; therefore, one department was not represented in the focus group but was added later during individual interviews). I determined the number of participants for the focus group based on recommendations made by Morgan (1997), who argued that the researcher must keep the focus group to a manageable number, between six and ten participants. I then followed up with individual interviews. To increase the likelihood that I followed through with interviewing informants who were identified as part of the active network here without making decisions about whom I interviewed based on my own personal likes and dislikes or based on who might give me data I wanted to obtain, I used a snowball technique, interviewing additional faculty members and instructional administrators at the institution based on recommendations from individuals involved in the focus group. I also conducted follow-up interviews with the informants who took part in the focus group to ensure that introverts could express themselves freely and to allow these informants to feel more of a sense of confidentiality. Also, as Morgan points out, "follow-up individual interviews can help provide depth and detail on topics that were only broadly discussed in group interviews" (1997, p. 23).

I selected informants based on their status as full-time or continuing part-time (thirty hours per week with benefits) faculty or as instructional administrators on faculty contracts. The existing research on community college scholarship is focused almost entirely on faculty, and the accepted definition of the word scholarship within academe is most often tied to promotion and tenure issues of faculty, not administrators. However, many of the faculty members here hold titles of Program Director or Coordinator and perform administrative duties in addition to their teaching duties, and, in fact, the majority of the informants in this study turned out to be in this category. Also, during the pilot study, I saw an opportunity for the research to effect political and social changes regarding the value, incentive, and reward for scholarship at the college when I interacted with mid-level administrators. During the study, the informants suggested that the opinions and perspectives of upper-level administrators were key to understanding the nature of scholarship here, so I included instructional administrators along with the faculty as potential informants during the snowball technique. Additionally, from a critical perspective, looking to effect change at the institution necessitates involving the instructional administration in the study.

I did my own transcribing as I found that the act of transcription brought me closer to the data and allowed me to engage in analysis at the same time. This also ensured that I was the only person who had access to the data and the informants' identities.

I triangulated the data with document analysis. During or after interviews, I asked most informants for copies of their job descriptions and other supporting documents related to their interviews. I consulted internal marketing and publications mentioned in the interviews for evidence of sharing or promoting scholarship. I consulted professional development reports for corroboration of professional development activities. I reviewed the current merit pay and awards guidelines. I read the college and system mission statements and goals, and I consulted other documents that were provided to me as a result of topics that arose during the course of the study.

Timeline

I successfully defended the proposal for this study in April of 2000, negotiated access to the college and the faculty (with the college president) in late June 2000, conducted the interviews from mid-July through early October, analyzed data from July through December of 2000, wrote the final chapters of the dissertation from August through December, and defended the dissertation in January of 2001.

I expect this study will fill a gap in the research regarding scholarship in the community college in that it uses a qualitative approach, and it looks at the problem from the perspective of an insider. This study focuses on one single case (one college) which is part of a state-level system with a unique history among colleges. My hope is that the results of this study will provide support for the creation of a new understanding and sense of value attached

to community college scholarship as it is seen within the context of the mission and history of the institution and that opportunities for faculty members to share their scholarly discourse with others within the state might arise.

Data Collection

Interviews

Because I am using an interpretive framework for this study (and, thus, wish to have a collaborative, conversational nature to my data collection), interviews were my best option. "Interviews have particular strengths. An interview is a useful way to get large amounts of data quickly" (Marshall and Rossman, 1999, p. 108). "Through elicitation and personal interaction, the investigator is better able to obtain data addressing the questions asked in the study" (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993, p. 166). I chose to begin with a focus group both to get a good overview of the views on the issues in the case and to create an opportunity for discussion among colleagues. When the researcher uses focus groups, explain Marshall and Rossman (1999), "the interview process gathers a wider variety of information across a larger number of subjects than if there were fewer participants" (p. 109). I found that the focus group engaged the informants in a conversation, perhaps helping them think more clearly about the issues in the case. As Marshall and Rossman (1999) point out, "this method assumes that an individual's attitudes and beliefs do not form in a vacuum: People often need to listen to others'

opinions and understandings in order to form their own" (p. 114). One major advantage of focus group interviews (an advantage that increased my opportunity to understand the shared realities regarding the issues in this case) is that the "method is socially oriented, studying participants in an atmosphere more natural than artificial experimental circumstances and more relaxed than the exposure of a one-to-one interview" (Marshall and Rossman, 1999, p. 115). But, to ensure that informants were able to express themselves candidly, one-on-one, without fear of repercussion from their expressing a divergent or unpopular view, I conducted individual, follow-up interviews with each of the seven participants in the focus group (see Appendix A for an example of the interview guide).

I then employed a snowball sampling technique (a choice I explain in the sampling section in this chapter), conducting individual interviews with informants suggested to me by the participants in the focus group; I conducted further interviews as new informants were suggested by additional interviewees.

I conducted a total of twenty-five individual interviews (with the seven key informants and then an additional eighteen based on the snowball technique). I interviewed them all on campus, reserving a room in a central location for the focus group interview and then meeting with informants in their offices or in mine, depending on the informant's choice, for scheduled individual interviews. The estimated length of time for the focus group was

two hours, and the individual interviews were completed in roughly one hour each. I audiotaped and transcribed the interviews myself. I used an interview guide for all interviews; as described by LeCompte and Preissle (1993), the "general interview guide is a set of issues . . . that the interviewer wants to discuss with the respondent. These issues may be addressed at any time in the conversation; the guide is a checklist" (p. 169).

The informants in the pilot study were candid and cooperative; two of them expressed excitement about participating in the study. One of these informants was available to be part of the focus group and the other was interviewed individually later. I chose additional participants for the focus group based on my knowledge of which faculty members would be amenable to participating, who might potentially be key informants, and based on recommendations from the first two members during the pilot study (this includes informants who are interested in scholarship and others who argue that scholarship has no place in the community college). I gave a gift to each participant in the focus group that day and gave a gift to each additional informant at the completion of all the interviews.

Of the twenty-five participants, two were upper-level instructional administrators, twenty-two were full-time faculty members (fourteen of whom hold titles of Program Director or Coordinator), and one was a continuing part-time instructor (working thirty hours per week). Fifteen out of the twenty-five informants (60%) have completed or are in the process of pursuing a doctoral

degree; nine have earned Master's degrees as their highest degree (36%); one has a vocational diploma (4%). Eleven informants are female (44%), while fourteen are male (56%). An estimated four informants are members of minority groups (16%). The twenty-three faculty members interviewed represent all of the academic departments on campus. Eleven are in the recently reorganized (to include General Education and University Transfer) Arts, Sciences, and University Transfer Department (48%). Three are in the Health Technologies Department (13%); three are in the Public Services Department (13%); three are in the Developmental Education Program (13%); two are in the Industrial and Engineering Technologies Department (9%); and one is in the Business Technologies Department (4%).

Documents

Reviewing documents is a good supplement to interviews in that it is "an unobtrusive method, rich in portraying the values and beliefs of participants in the setting" (Marshall and Rossman, 1999, p. 116). I used documents similar to the type I found useful during the pilot study to triangulate. These documents include the following: internal marketing and publications; professional development reports; job descriptions; merit pay policies and procedures; the college mission statement, goals, and objectives; innovation award guidelines; and additional materials provided to me by informants.

Data Analysis

Data analysis, according to LeCompte and Preissle (1993) is both time-consuming and labor-intensive; the heart of data analysis, they claim, comes as the researcher pulls apart the field notes, matches, compares, and contrasts the data (p. 237). Marshall and Rossman (1999) add that analysis brings order, structure, and interpretation to the piles of data the researcher has amassed. It is not a linear process, they assert, "it is not neat" (p. 150).

Simultaneous Collection and Analysis

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) describe data analysis as "organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned" (p. 127). "Data analysis done simultaneously with data collection," they advise, "enables you to focus and shape the study as it proceeds" (p. 127). On this point, Merriam (1999) goes so far as to say that simultaneous data collection and analysis is the only way to go about the task of analysis; it's the "right way," according to Merriam (p. 162). While collecting and analyzing data for the pilot study of this case, I found that simultaneous collection and analysis came naturally to me. I found that the process was, as Merriam described it should be, "recursive and dynamic" (1999, p. 155). By engaging in analysis as the data unfolds, I find that I have more time to process the data, become familiar with it and with the expressive styles of my informants. I began to formulate coding categories and used the data to help me guide further collection. This process also helped me to stay engaged and

excited about the research. I agree with Glesne and Peshkin's assertion that "by each effort of data analysis, you enhance your capacity to further analyze" (p. 129). The nature of qualitative research demands that the researcher link data collection and analysis, assert LeCompte and Preissle (1993). The strategies used depend on feedback from the field; this feedback may alter the research questions as the researcher "gains deepened understanding of the culture under study and learns the meanings participants attach to things" (p. 238).

Constant Comparison

During the process of data analysis, coding categories, tentative themes, and possible findings presented themselves. In order to move toward a more accurate understanding of the issues and themes in the case, I found that I must go beyond analytic induction in the manner devised by Glaser and Strauss (1967), a strategy they termed constant comparison. As LeCompte and Preissle (1993) describe it, this strategy combines inductive coding procedures with a comparative approach. As data are transcribed and coded, they are compared across categories. Throughout the process, new relationships and themes emerge and are analyzed further as new data are collected. The process feeds back upon itself. The strengths of this procedure are that it is useful as a constructive procedure and it is flexible (p. 256). While engaged in data collection and analysis during the pilot study, I heard myself describe the process more than a few times as "chasing my tail."

What I realize now is that I was experiencing something akin to what I describe here as the constant comparative method; happily, the activity turned out to be more productive than I had initially thought; in essence, after much cognitive exercise, I caught my tail.

Organizing and Coding the Data

I transcribed all data myself, shortly after each interview. Although time consuming, this act allowed me to become intimate with the data and gave me an opportunity to engage in analysis at the same time. I tended to stop in the midst of transcribing to write memos and researcher comments as I saw connections or refuting evidence regarding the issues in the case. With so much technology available these days to assist in data management, I initially scoffed at a professor's suggestion that cutting and pasting interview data with actual paper and scissors was helpful. However, I found that I was more clear and organized when I used this technique. I ended up with piles of interview data, pieces of paper of varying sizes, for each code. Having these concrete materials to manipulate eased the writing process for me. Breaking up the data from each interview allowed me to begin to see an overall structure emerge, which aided me in beginning my analysis of the data. As Glesne and Peshkin (1992) advise, "by putting like-minded pieces together into data clumps, you create an organizational framework" (p. 133).

I also found that organizing my own researcher comments was helpful; I took Glesne and Peshkin's recommendation that keeping a reflective field log

is helpful in this respect in that it aids the researcher in remaining open to new perspectives and thoughts and in capturing analytic thoughts when they occur. They also support the practice of keeping files to organize important material such as subjectivity-related memos, possible titles, introductory and concluding remarks, and quotations (p. 128-129).

Writing the Report

Marshall and Rossman (1999) instruct that the researcher combine the analytic process with the writing process. By choosing words to summarize and reflect the complexity of the data, the researcher interprets, gives meaning to, the raw data (p. 157-158). My writing process tends to be rather linear, in that I like to follow a flexible outline, but also recursive in that I tend to loop back frequently as a conceptual check and generative tool. I began writing the report shortly after I began to gather the data, focusing first on a discussion of an historical nature. Because I found the act of writing to be helpful for analysis, my initial drafts generated relatively early in the process tended to be spotty and reflected noteworthy comments made during recent interviews. I found that these pages needed much more context later, and I revised as new data informed the study. The bulk of the writing of the final chapters did not occur until all the data were transcribed, analyzed, and synthesized, however.

Validity

In the next two sections, I will discuss how issues of validity and reliability were dealt with in this study. My premise is taken from Merriam (1998); that is, my assumption regarding qualitative research is that within this context, "ensuring validity and reliability . . . involves conducting the investigation in an ethical manner" (p. 201). Therefore, issues of validity and reliability must be tied closely to issues of ethics and of the researcher's role in the study.

Internal Validity

Merriam's claim that internal validity "hinges on the meaning of reality" (1998, p. 201) is a key aspect of qualitative design and has special implications for me, given my interpretive framework (more on this later). She further qualifies this by saying, "what is being observed are people's constructions of reality--how they understand the world" (p. 203). The strength of qualitative research in terms of internal validity is that it allows the researcher to act as instrument, thus getting closer to an understanding of the shared reality of the informants in the case. As Merriam (1998) states,

> Because human beings are the primary instrument of data collection and analysis . . . interpretations of reality are accessed directly through their observations and interviews. We are thus "closer" to reality than if a data collection instrument had been interjected between us and the participants . . . When reality is

viewed in this manner, internal validity is a definite strength of qualitative research. (p. 203)

To enhance one's internal validity in a case study, Merriam (1998, p. 204-205) suggests the following strategies, which I applied to this study in the following manner: (a) triangulation: I used multiple sources of data to come to a more holistic understanding of the case; (b) peer examination: This occured in two modes, in collaboration with my colleagues (the informants in the study) and with my dissertation committee members who guided my research; (c) collaborative approach: Here I return to one of the strengths of my chosen theoretical framework. The interpretive lens allows me to understand the nature of community college scholarship through a collaboration with my informants. We discovered meaning through the process of conducting the research, interpreting and redefining using our discourse as a means to question accepted constructs and find a liminal space where knowledge could be understood and shared; (d) researcher biases: I have been honest and thorough regarding my biases and strengths as a researcher in this case study (see section re: role of researcher).

External Validity (Generalizability)

The consideration of external validity has been described as inappropriate within the realm of qualitative research (Eisner and Peshkin, 1990, p. 171), but I am comfortable with the notion as Merriam (1998) describes it. She says, in "qualitative research, a single case or small

nonrandom sample is selected precisely *because* the researcher wishes to understand the particular in depth, not to find out what is generally true of the many" (p. 208). I view external validity in terms of reader generalizability, which Merriam (1998) explains as putting the application to other situations in the lap of the reader who looks to use the data for purposes of generalization. The practitioner determines the level of applicability; I, as researcher, have "an obligation to provide enough detailed description of the study's context to enable readers to compare the 'fit' with their situations" (p. 211). Donmoyer (1990) agrees with this interpretation; he submits that "the purpose of research is simply to expand the range of interpretations available to the research consumer" (p. 194). For case studies in particular, Donmoyer (1990) suggests that the goal of the research should be to "expand and enrich the repertoire of social constructions available to practitioners and others;" it may be more useful, he says, to think of external validity "in more psychological terms" (p. 182). I have attempted to give thick description of the case, the informants, and the data to enable readers to have the tools to determine whether the findings are generalizable to their situations or to other cases.

Reliability

My qualitative study is not designed with the expectation that one could replicate the study. In this case study, I am attempting to understand the nature of community college scholarship at one institution, at one time, within the conceptual framework of interpretivism. I believe that the simple act of

conducting a qualitative study alters the shared realities of the participants and in so doing changes the data one might have access to; additionally, because the researcher is an integral part of the study, without cloning the researcher, replicate findings would not be obtainable.

Merriam (1998) cautions that reliability "is based on the assumption that there is a single reality and that studying it repeatedly will yield the same results" but qualitative research "is not conducted so that the laws of human behavior can be isolated. Rather, researchers seek to describe and explain the world as those in the world experience it" (p. 205).

I do not see reliability as the correct term; I prefer to understand reliability in the manner adopted by Lincoln and Guba (1985), who argue that qualitative researchers should concern themselves with showing that their results are consistent with their data, not that their results are replicable. In this study, I focus on ensuring that the data are consistent with the findings I present. I use triangulation of data through document review and multiple interviews (which I transcribed verbatim) and am clear with readers about my theoretical assumptions and views, my sampling procedures, and my methods for analysis.

My Role as Researcher

Marshall and Rossman (1999) submit that "in qualitative studies, the researcher is the instrument: Her presence in the lives of the participants invited to be part of the study is fundamental to the paradigm" (p. 79). Thus,

my background and relationships with the issues and the participants in the study are important aspects of the study. With this in mind, I offer a discussion of my background, including potential benefits and biases that might affect the study, before I move on to the topic of ethics.

There is an autobiographical element to my chosen research topic in the sense that I fit the parameters I have identified for selection of informants, and I conducted the study as an insider. I believe that being open with my informants, my readers, and myself about my roles, my personal beliefs, values, interests, avocations, and such as they became relevant to the study was essential. I also believe that my ability to be open was affected by the context of the interaction, the informants themselves, and time and structure constraints, among other considerations. I expect that the areas of myself relevant to this case that were not initially in my view, my consciousness, were revealed throughout the process of conducting my research. I see the process as an educational and enlightening experience through which I learned about the nature of scholarship in the case and also about myself as a community college instructor and administrator, as a researcher, as a communicator, as a colleague, as a writer, and more.

As an insider, I believe that intensive and extensive study, as described by Marshall and Rossman (1999, p. 80) was more easily accomplished because I am a member of the faculty, am on site typically forty hours per week, and have developed a strong rapport with many of the informants prior

to conducting research. I have been at the institution for eight years, full-time, beginning with the title of Coordinator/Instructor and then promoted to Director/Instructor. As such, I hold a dual position as both faculty and instructional administrator. I teach both Developmental Studies English and General Education English courses, and I am the Director of the Campus Learning Center, which is structured organizationally within the Educational Resources Department, and I report to the Associate Dean of Educational Resources who reports to the Vice President, Chief Instructional Officer.

I am a white female in my early thirties; I was raised in a small town in Northern New York, near the St. Lawrence River; my mother is a retired professor of psychiatric nursing. She taught at a small community/junior college and holds a master's degree. Education was of utmost importance in our family--all seven children earned bachelor's degrees; five have earned master's degrees. I am presently pursuing a doctoral degree in Higher Education Administration within the area of Adult and Community College Education.

I suspect that my understanding of the nature of community colleges is somewhat colored by experiences related to me by my mother; in this sense, I may have a vague comparative lens at play. But it was the differences between her experiences and my own that led me to consider how the history and organization of the community college in my case study may influence the nature of scholarship and realities for faculty here. I am focusing on this one

institution not in a comparative sense but as a bounded system, a term described by LeCompte and Preissle as referring to a system containing a population that exists independently of my interest and is recognized by its constituent participants (1993, p. 61).

My interest and learned belief that education is important also plays a role in my desire to both continue my own education and see the world through analytic and interpretive lenses. I place great value on both teaching and learning, and, in many ways, have followed in my mother's footsteps in my career. The support, encouragement, and drive to aspire to educational attainment come from tacit family values. These are assets to me; they have aided me in completing my study and keep me focused on quality work.

My research has helped me to understand the nature of scholarship, which will, in turn, help me be more focused and effective in my career. I hope to remain in instructional administration and learn to be responsive to the realities and needs of faculty who may report to me and be my colleagues.

At the same time, I am aware of other barriers that may have impeded the process, including my gender, age, race, personality, and such. These considerations will be discussed further in the following section, which describes my perceptions on possible strengths and biases in the study.

Possible Strengths and Biases

One strength of this study is that I do not have legitimate power in my relationships with informants; in this sense, the study is not politically asymmetrical (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993, p. 99). I interviewed colleagues either with similar standing within the institution or who hold positions of legitimate power over me. I do not expect that my position has impeded data collection, but, rather, has eased the process. Informants seemed to want to assist me either out of a sense of collegiality or vague mentoring relationship (due to more time in their positions, older age, or higher position within the college).

Another strength of the study was also apparent in the pilot study. That is, informants expressed a sense of intellectual excitement generated by the interviews and were thankful for being included. They expressed plans for implementing changes based on ideas they generated within the context of the study. The focus group interview was especially engaging and thought-provoking; many participants thanked me for having included them in the study.

I have eight years of experience as a community college faculty member and administrator; I understand the context of the site and the realities of the faculty from an insider's perspective. I have been able to draw on my expertise and experience in conducting this study. Sensitivity, integrity, and ethics are central to my study because I must maintain a healthy, positive

relationship with my colleagues. I have been cautious to offer reciprocity to the informants in the form of gifts, so they would know that their time and effort are valued. I also offered use of my expertise to the institutional leaders for granting me access and educational leave during my studies. I have granted the college president's request to give a bound copy of my dissertation to the college library.

In dealing with biases related to subjectivity, I have made efforts to identify the nature and source of my biases and endeavored to take them into consideration throughout the study. Varying levels of subjectivity were acknowledged within the context of interactions with various informants, depending on the informant's professional position, reputation and status within the institution, personal relationship with me, race, gender, age, and other such determinants. I found that I had to adjust my approach and be wary of my subjective leaning toward personal and professional interests rather than on the case and its issues under study.

I also had to continually make the familiar strange (Erickson,1973) during my research; as an insider, I was aware that there may be a tendency to miss the obvious and assume intended meaning rather than probe for explication from informants. Using grounded theory in a loose sense helped with this; I wrote memos to help me process the data I was collecting and analyzing throughout the study. As Charmaz defines them, memos "are written èlaborations of ideas about the data and the coded categories. [They]

represent the development of codes from which they are derived" (1994, p. 106). The memos I wrote at the beginning of the study helped me determine the direction of the study; later memos helped me make connections among coding categories and within the data. From the start, clear trends and common views began to emerge. In later interviews, I remained especially tuned to data that supported or appeared to alter those emerging trends. Often, informants used metaphors or examples that proved to be key in explicating the findings; I made special note of such instances in memos. These memos were vital contributions to the writing of the final report.

Ethics

In qualitative case studies, the close relationship between researcher and informant necessitates a strong ethical code on the part of the researcher; there is the potential for ethical dilemmas to arise, given the nature of human interactions. In my study, I was aware of possible ethical issues related to the methods I used for collecting, analyzing, and sharing my data.

During the data collection phase of my research, I considered the ethics involved in both interviewing and document review. As Merriam (1999) points out, the process of interviewing can create both "risks and benefits" for the informants. They may "feel their privacy has been invaded . . . be embarrassed . . . tell things they had never intended to reveal" (p. 214). But the interview may also "improve the condition" of the informants, may

stimulate them to "act on their own behalf," may be enjoyable to them, and may cause them to "gain valuable self-knowledge" (Merriam, 1999, p. 214). Prior to interviewing informants, I sent them an introductory letter (see Appendix B), informing them of the purpose of the study, the role they would play, and the time line for the interviews, offering them the opportunity to decline to participate in the study if they wished to do so. Individuals who agreed to be interviewed (only one declined) were given a consent form to sign, which acknowledged that I will keep all materials and identities confidential (see Appendix C). Informants had the opportunity to withdraw their consent at any time.

Anonymity

Informants were concerned about whether readers of the study could attach specific comments to them and determine who they were based on my description of them. To ease their concerns and prompt them to be more candid in their interviews, I assured them I would protect their anonymity by not using their names and by fictionalizing the name of the college and locating the college only generally as being in the southeastern United States. I further agreed that within the text of the study, I would not assign comments directly to informants unless the content of the discussion necessitated me doing so. I use randomly selected letters as identification for individual speakers, giving no more data about them than is necessary for readers to understand the issues in the case.

Documents

Although document review may not at first appear to present ethical dilemmas, I was wary about taking that for granted; as Kelman (1982) warns, "ethical problems arise only when respondents agree to provide information for one purpose and the data are then used for a clearly different purpose" (p. 81). Because I have seen colleagues' personal and work-related documents, I communicated with informants regarding how documents would be used within the study as they were provided to me.

As I analyzed and reported my data, I was clear and open about my biases in an effort keep them from interfering with my analysis. I worked toward generating conclusions as honestly as possible, citing data that corroborate my findings, and providing adequate data from the case to enable readers to make come to their own conclusions. Diener and Crandall (1978) call for such an approach; they submit that the researcher be focused on providing a nonbiased account, ensuring accuracy, and practicing honesty throughout the research process. When a bias cannot be overcome, they submit that it must be discussed in the final report. Furthermore, they argue, when the data in the case do not support the predictions fully, the researcher must include ample enough data so as to enable the readers to come to their own conclusions about the case.

In any instance where ethics became an issue, I responded with integrity and compassion, keeping the informants' privacy, ensuring

confidentiality, and upholding obligations. Respect for the right of the informants, the site, and the research process guided my work.

Resources Needed

Understanding the resources required for completing a study is a crucial aspect of research and a critical test of the researcher's ability to conduct the study. Consideration of these demands demonstrates that the researcher is knowledgeable about qualitative research, understands the need for flexibility, and recognizes potential personal and financial demands inherent in taking on the role of researcher (Marshall and Rossman, 1999, p. 168).

In planning for this study, I have identified and met the demands related to completing the work, with the realization that additional demands may potentially have been realized during the course of the defense. I am interested in the topic I have chosen to study and excited about having conducted the research, and I have made a personal commitment of time and energy to do so. I have maintained a timeline for the study and have dedicated the time necessary to conduct the research and transcribe the data in a timely manner; I made a commitment to transcribe each interview soon after it was conducted. Because I am working full-time, I also anticipated needing to take vacation days during this time to give me additional flexibility. I have a strong support network of colleagues, friends, and family who also helped me to stay focused on and committed to the research.

I have looked to my committee members to provide support for my choices of topic, methodology, and theoretical framework. My dissertation chair is very knowledgeable regarding my topic, and other members of my committee have expertise in qualitative methodology. I have felt supported in my learning and in the process for conducting the study. As Marshall and Rossman (1999) submit, "faculty support and encouragement are critical for developing research proposals that are substantial, elegant, and doable and for advocacy in the larger university community to legitimize this particular study and qualitative research generally" (p. 183).

The other demand I have faced is financial. I was aware of the costs involved in conducting this study, and I was aware that additional costs may arise. I was prepared to finance the study personally, and was gifted with a departmental fellowship to help with financing my research. I purchased a transcribing machine; I had a personal computer and access to databases and software to assist in my research; and I purchased texts and amassed articles related to my topic. I spent roughly $1800 - $2000 on tuition during my dissertation hours. I also spent an additional $1400 - $1500 to complete the study; these costs included the following items: computer disks, note cards, transcribing machine, two tape recorders, batteries, fifty-four tapes, various books, paper, copying, binding, and gifts for the informants.

CHAPTER FOUR: Interpretation of the Data

Before presenting the findings in this case, let me remind the readers of three key aspects of this study. First, I am conducting insider research and have an ethical obligation to keep my informants' identities confidential. For this reason, I offer a brief guide to informants' identities, giving information regarding the area of the college they represent and their employment status only (see Appendix E). It is my informed belief that additional information about the informants is superfluous and would not provide any benefit to the reader in understanding the issues in the case. Second, as a researcher I am employing an interpretive frame in looking at the data in this case study. According to Stake, in case study research, the aim "is not to discover [an external reality], for that is impossible, but to construct a clearer [experiential reality] and a more sophisticated [rational reality (i.e. integrated interpretations)]" (1995, p. 100-101). The case study researcher must clarify descriptions and interpret interpretations; an interpretivist view, says Stake (1995), "encourages providing readers with good raw material for their own generalizing. The emphasis is on [thick] description" (p. 102). The qualitative case study researcher must attempt to "preserve the multiple realities" present in the case, even as they appear contradictory (p. 12).

Finally, I look to Giroux's (1981) arguments regarding cultural reproduction and Bowers' (1987) considerations for individual action to inform this study. As Giroux submits, "cultural reproduction . . . represents the

transmission of the culture of the dominant class . . . the cultural hegemony, or dominant form of cultural capital, consists of those attitudes, dispositions, tastes, linguistic competencies, and systems of meaning that the ruling-class deems as being legitimate" (p. 71). Because this theory does not allow for individual action, I looked to Bowers (1987) to refine the framework.

Bowers considers the nature of power in relation to language and culture. He says, "the relativizing of cultural traditions means that individuals and groups with greater skill in using (and manipulating) the language system will exercise power in naming and thus controlling how others will view social reality" (1987, p. 28). He calls this skill in language "communicative competence" and defines it as "the individual's ability to negotiate meanings and purposes instead of passively accepting the social realities defined by others" (Bowers, 1987, p. 2). Communicative competence, says Bowers, "requires, beyond individual facility in speech situations, a knowledge of relevant issues and the conceptual frameworks that influence our way of thinking" (1987, p. 2). Once the cultural hegemony is questioned, once beliefs and constructs are "made explicit and examined in a critical manner, they lose their traditional hold on us," says Bowers (1987, p. 6). This ability of our society to allow for negotiation of ideology and meaning creates opportunity for our cultural reproduction to be halted or altered. Bowers explains that "as taken-for-granted beliefs are made explicit and are challenged, there is a moment in social and conceptual time when the

individual experiences the temporary openness of liminal space . . . [at this time] new definitions can be presented, and the conceptual foundations of authority renegotiated" (1987, p. 6-7). The role of discourse, within this liminal space, is political, says Bowers; individuals who have communicative competence are presented with an opportunity to define reality on their terms.

Definitions

The reality at this community college is that a definition for the term scholarship is clearly unclear and most certainly uncertain. The participants in the focus group spent much time and energy discussing this issue, and they returned to it often when discussing other issues in the case. The problem is that there is no accepted definition for this term here; it is not part of the institutional discourse. In fact, more than one informant claimed that hearing me use it in an interview was the first time he/she had heard the term applied to this college or even used casually among the faculty here. But so much is happening here that I can clearly identify as scholarship, I thought. I suspected that there must be another term used here to apply to these activities. And so there is; in fact, there are two terms that faculty seem to be more comfortable using when discussing involvement in scholarly endeavors at this institution. The terms are faculty development and professional development. These terms appear to focus more on scholarship as a process that one engages in to improve the institution or the faculty member. The term scholarship, it seems, connotes a product to most of the informants, not

necessarily a process or a growth but simply, as one informant put it, a "contribution to one's discipline, something that moves the discipline forward."

After soliciting emic definitions (definitions generated from the informants themselves) of the term scholarship, I presented the informants with paragraphs regarding three definitions from the literature. These definitions included one written by George Vaughan in 1988, a compilation of ideas from Ernest Boyer's work in 1990 and 1997, and one penned by Lee Shulman in 1999 (see Appendix D). Aspects of Vaughan's and Boyer's definitions were popular and easily seen as applicable, in a piecemeal sense, to activities faculty members engage in at this college. The peer review requirement was most often cited as the missing element. While many informants found the wording of Shulman's (1999) definition stilted and vague, they saw some value in it in terms of the reality here. Shulman (1999) sought to define a new term, the Scholarship of Teaching, which he described as "problem posing about an issue of teaching or learning, study of the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies, application of results to practice, communication of results, self-reflection, and peer review" (p. 11). One faculty member finds the need to create a separate and new definition in order to legitimize teaching as a form of scholarship problematic; it should be a valid form of scholarship without needing to be separate from other forms, she argues. An administrator feels that the "notion of the Scholarship of Teaching is most likely to be discussed at a

community college." This administrator states further that he hopes "the faculty would engage in a pursuit of the teaching discipline, the teaching act, in a scholarly way." For the "Scholarship of Teaching to start," he says,

> NN: People [must] think of themselves as teachers . . . see their interaction with students as their primary focus . . . When an instructor starts to pursue the improvement of [his or her] teaching . . . in a considered and deliberate way, that's another aspect of scholarship . . . When they are willing to share what they're doing with a broader community of teachers and expose what they are doing to a review by their peers and a willingness to accept peer review in a constructive way, that's another aspect of scholarship.

The emic definitions included aspects of the definitions offered in the literature, but they also tended to divert from these definitions in two key ways. The informants kept returning to the idea that scholarship here is more easily understood as a process than as a product and that scholarship should be pragmatic.

Community College Scholarship: Process or Product?

The faculty members here see their scholarship as a process. In fact, one informant simply forgot to mention a book she had published, focusing more intently on telling me about the processes she goes through to improve herself and her program. The book was an afterthought, not sanctioned or

rewarded by the institution, not touted by the writer. More important was the teaching. Another informant put it this way: Scholarship and teaching go together; they have to; they are "part of a living chain." The instructional administration agrees; the purpose of the faculty here is "not to enhance the body of literature [in their disciplines]. Maybe the role of the community college is to start promoting proto-scholarship." My sense of what this administrator means by the term proto-scholarship is that, perhaps, community colleges could find their scholarly niche in creating a new type of scholarship, something specific to the community college, defined within the context of its teaching mission. Another administrator had this to say:

> RR: I don't think that scholarship is something that has to be reduced to a writing or a record . . . my sense of it is that at universities, scholarship typically is understood more in terms of a work product, something that can easily be reviewed by a wide audience.

At the community college, he says, "we are probably more accepting or willing to define something as scholarship, even if it's not reduced to a permanent record." At other institutions, scholarship is tied to tenure and faculty rank; therefore, these institutions must have clear definitions and guidelines to determine what is and what is not scholarship. There is no system of tenure here and, while there is discussion of creating one, for now, there is no faculty ranking system; therefore, there is little need for defining the term clearly. As

a rule, no one is expected to engage in scholarship, and no one is typically rewarded for doing so.

There is a slight caveat to this unwritten rule. That is, if a faculty member wishes to engage in a scholarly activity, and it is directly related to the improvement or enhancement of himself or herself as a teacher, or of his or her program more generally, this activity may be sanctioned, and perhaps even encouraged, by the administration. An important aspect of a definition of community college scholarship here is whether the activity can lead to direct application in the classroom or to the improvement of teaching and learning. In addition to "staying current in one's discipline" or "increasing [one's] knowledge in [one's] field," community college faculty must engage in scholarship "from a practitioner's viewpoint." The knowledge one gains and the expertise one develops is valuable only in as much as it improves what one does in his or her role as an educator. One University Transfer faculty member expresses the difference between her definition of scholarship for this institution and the traditional definitions in this way:

> QQ: In the community college, because we don't [typically] do research, I still believe we do scholarship, but it is a scholarship that we apply in our teaching so the dissemination of that knowledge is what differentiates the two. One would be through research and the other would be through the classroom or conversations about how we apply what we know in the classroom. It could take on other forms. In the community college, you can still do research. It is up to you. Many of us are

> involved in professional organizations. Many of us sometimes publish, and that is a part of the traditional definition. But I think that it is really the purpose of the pursuit of knowledge that makes us different. One is really for research and the other is for dissemination in the classroom.

A comparison of the community college and universities led others to differentiate the two in terms of definitions, as well. One upper-level administrator cautioned that faculty who come from a university background must understand this difference. "It's important that they understand that we don't have the resources or the mission or the intention of pursuing knowledge for its own sake," he said. "We do have expectations for outcomes here, so I think the notion of scholarship has to be balanced with that notion of application." A University Transfer faculty member explains the problematic aspects of defining the term scholarship for community colleges in this manner:

> VV: Part of the problem is that there are two types of activities going on that aren't similar . . . It seems to me to be two different things and almost two different types of art in a way. You try to put them together and come up with a common definition, and I don't think that works. You have a different purpose.

A faculty member in the General Education area calls for a redefinition of the term. "Because the community colleges are focused on teaching," she argues, "scholarship could be redefined, not to exclude the disciplines, but to include the study of various ways of teaching and learning . . . at the

community college, the research is more based on people -- how they learn, how they interact, how they teach."

As I mentioned, a clear definition of scholarship for this institution is elusive, but the process of discussing this issue during the focus group interview proved to be quite interesting. The following comments are excerpted from the transcripts of that focus group interview; these comments are typical of the views of the informants:

> YY: When teachers publish, they usually don't publish about teaching. They publish in terms of their content.
> QQ: That has to do with the traditional definition. That is the way you learn it in grad school. Your profs instill in you that you are a good scholar if you publish in your area. Something that doesn't matter to a lot of people but that doesn't matter because it moves the discipline forward. When it comes to doing research on your own teaching, it is kind of lost for good reasons, of course it is the load and it is sometimes hard to measure, it has to do in my case more with social sciences than humanities and my training is in humanities. Something always seems to be missing there for us teachers not be able to contribute to the redefinition of scholarship.
> WW: I think you see that with the Scholarship of Teaching definition, that the second part of it is really sort of scientific scholarship. This is scientific language and it is being used here to apply that to teaching humanities or arts, that doesn't really work. Reflection, peer review. That sounds like I'm submitting something to a scientific journal and waiting from the results from my colleagues. Whereas teaching, and I think that part of the problem is the elitism of traditional scholarship over teaching scholarship.

Teaching is so hard to quantify and hard to measure, you won't see these results . . . they would be laughed at in the academy. It is so difficult to have a strict definition because it's so subjective, what works for one person won't necessarily work for others. Becomes individualistic.

WW: So we're making distinctions between scholarship and the scholarship of teaching. We're looking at it in terms of a very practical application. If somebody is just researching to get information, we are questioning whether that's actually scholarship because they are not teaching that information to someone. If they just engage in research, according to us they're not engaged in scholarship if they don't teach that. Traditionally it's the reverse, who cares if you teach it, nobody's interested; what are you doing for the discipline? That's what people [at the university are concerned about] but here, we're concerned about how are we getting the students to apply the scholarship that we have.

SS: I heard you refer to good teaching regarding the scholarship of teaching, almost equating that. Is that true?

XX: At [this college], if we're [involved] in scholarship, advanced learning of our field, if we don't pass it on to the students, we're not really [involved] in scholarship. We're here to pass it on to the students.

SS: So, you're saying good teaching is equivalent to the scholarship of teaching. Scholarly teaching—what is the difference between that and the scholarship of teaching? Sounds so similar. What the [AAHE] conference was about was making that delineation. So, I see what you described as scholarly teaching. The product is the students according to [our accrediting body]. I may have diverged somewhat, but I don't think I have.

YY: Are you saying that the scholarship of teaching might be the body of knowledge we have about good teaching and that scholarly teaching is using that body of knowledge?

CKK: When does someone move from being engaged in scholarly teaching to being engaged in scholarship? If there is a delineation there, as SS suggests, using XX's example of scholarly teaching, how does he know that he has engaged in the scholarship of teaching? What has to happen?

YY: One of the things is he has to share the results with others.

QQ: To move the discipline of teaching forward the same way that you share your research, making it public, sharing, contributions include collect the data, portfolio, present at conference.

YY: What about less formally?

QQ: The biggest contribution would be sharing within his teaching area....but he can share with me and I can take that idea and get your own insights, but to move the profession forward, the teaching of your subject shared with others in your area. Conferences, meetings.

YY: So in your view the scholarship of teaching is discipline specific?

QQ: Not really, he could go to conference on teaching with me, I could get an approach from him but it might not fit in my discipline. I could adapt to my discipline. I don't see the scholarship of teaching without sharing results.

SS: Communication of results within appropriate forum.

QQ: Appropriate forum may take different forms.

WW: We're also fighting our own prejudices with the term scholarship. I was brought up within this academic culture where scholarship has a very specific meaning. It has nothing to do with

> teaching. Scholarship is researching and publishing in your field. It's an elitist attitude, but it's the definition that was drilled into many of us throughout our undergraduate careers and throughout our graduate careers that this is scholarship. Teaching is what you have to do to do scholarship. It doesn't matter how you teach in the university system. We're dealing with a lot of prejudice on how to define it, even when we decide, well, let's define it this way, we're still reminded that the prejudice is still creeping in.

At the close of the focus group interview, we were not much closer to determining a clear definition, but the final comments of one faculty member reminded us that we were, perhaps, engaged in the process of scholarship while we struggled with creating a product. Here are his insights and a few reactions to his closing:

> SS: Well, I see our meeting as having attempted to define scholarship . . . in the meta-mode . . . we have a research question going on here. We have been engaged in scholarship this entire time. This is good. That's what we should want to be going on here at the school. The research question is "What is Scholarship?" Did we make it beyond the initial definitions of it? Well, we made it to posing a question and studying a question, have we made it to application of results? I'm not sure because we don't have, well, maybe we don't have to come to consensus and that could be a result of our discourse here. It's interesting to note that what we're trying to discuss we are already engaged in.
>
> WW: [You're] playing with my head, man...(all laugh)
>
> YY: I am still concerned about a definition we could apply to [this college] that we could be successful with.

Community College Faculty and Academic Discourse: Members or Guests?

As readers might have noticed, there is discourse from the interviews where speakers identify themselves as feeling somewhat disenfranchised within academe. The language focuses on words such as acceptance, elitism, and worthiness. As has been noted in a recent publication (see Townsend and LaPaglia, 2000), community college faculty members tend to believe that university faculty members see them as second best. In an attempt to define scholarship, one instructor describes it as "some type of research endeavor that peers feel is worthy of the title." The peers who are traditionally considered qualified to judge one's endeavor, though, are university scholars. "Scholarship," he says, "is like a party; you can invite yourself there, but you might not be accepted." He adds, further, that "you can identify with scholars; but they have to accept you." Later, he adds this comment:

> OO: I believe community colleges have gotten a little respect; we've gotten a foot in the door to showcase. In the past, folk looked down on community colleges. Community college faculty weren't invited to speak. [In my discipline] now, they have a committee to address community college issues specifically. The door opened up; the structure opened up. We got invited to the party. The community college has been a neglected baby whose time has come. The baby is feeding itself now!

This informant takes an optimistic view of the community college's place within academe; he believes we find ourselves in a time and place where the

work of community college faculty is becoming more valued within community colleges and within academe. Other community college faculty members are not as hopeful that times are changing.

Culture of the College re: Scholarship

Scholarship is Valued . . . Or Is It?

The most common response to the question "How does [this college] approach the issue of scholarship?" was "It doesn't." An administrator puts it more gently, saying there is no "statement or policy that expresses a formal position on" scholarship, but his perception is that it is the culture of the institution that scholarship is valued and that individuals who choose to engage in scholarly activities are supported, and in some cases are acknowledged in a non-systematic way. The culture of this institution, as described by this administrator, differs from the cultures described in the existing literature on community college scholarship. The existing literature describes community colleges as having cultures that not only do not support faculty scholarship but often reprimand faculty members who do engage in scholarly endeavors (consult Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993; Vaughan, 1991). The descriptions of the campus culture in this case given by the faculty are more in concert with the accounts in the literature. One faculty member put it this way: This college approaches the issue of faculty scholarship "with a chip on its shoulder. There is a culture here that it is too refined for us, that you are too big for your britches [if you want to be a scholar]. I think that if

someone gets published in a peer-reviewed journal we should spread it all over; it's such a difficult thing to do, and here it hardly even gets mentioned." This last comment reflects a message I heard loud and clear from the informants; this institution needs more opportunities for faculty members to share their scholarship and scholarly activities with one another. "It's not prevalent; I do know [scholarship] is going on in some places . . . the part about sharing it with others is not happening that much."

A number of informants feel that no one here cares if the faculty members are engaged in any form of scholarship. Here are two similar accounts on this issue: One faculty member says, "I could be teaching nonsense, but if I'm teaching nonsense over the Internet, I could get rewarded for it." Another faculty member says, "I don't think scholarship is a priority. There are instructors here who just get up and read to students out of the textbook . . . I would say administratively they do just fine; no one cares, administratively, no one cares." An Arts, Sciences, and University Transfer instructor describes it more colorfully. "It's something that the instructor has to seek," he says; "it's not a carrot dangling in front of you; you have to look under rocks. It's a sort of knock-and-you-shall-enter pursuit. It's not a priority." How evaluations are conducted is of concern to some faculty members, too. There are times when a supervisor might sit in on an instructor's class with the purpose of evaluating the instructor, but this happens very seldom, and evaluations are seen as being benign at best; the

evaluators are seen as adequately prepared to evaluate, at best. The only evaluations that are seen as routinely done are those completed by students, and there are moderate repercussions for a faculty member whose student evaluations are consistently poor. But, in terms of a faculty member's scholarship, some informants worried that while student evaluations "are valuable, students are not competent to judge the content that is being presented to them. If [faculty members] do not keep up with [their] field, [students] won't know that either. None of that gets addressed" at this institution.

On a positive note, most informants pointed to the new Teaching and Learning Center as evidence that faculty scholarship may be beginning to be valued and supported by the institution in a more concrete manner. "So far," says one informant, "it provides opportunities for people to come together and have conversations about learning and provides time to do paperwork for people to go to conferences." In a general sense, the informants see the college as giving "a lot of latitude . . . for one's endeavors" and that scholarship is "not discouraged here"; it's just not encouraged campus-wide. Many informants mentioned several faculty members and administrators who "promote scholarship and involvement, they value it, but it is individual, not part of the institutional culture." But, the fact that faculty members are able to engage in scholarship without negative repercussions indicates that there is, as one informant called it, an "openness to it. Giving me that freedom,"

she says, "is a way of promoting it." There is a liminal space, as Bowers (1973) called it, a space where the faculty can cultivate themselves as scholars here. "If you want to take the initiative," says another informant, "you can create things for yourself." With a hopeful tone, informants discuss the new Teaching and Learning Center yet again. "Several goals of the Teaching and Learning Center have to do with scholarship. The college isn't putting a lot of people and resources into it [yet]," says one informant, while another calls it "a nice start because that does create a community; it's a small effort, but it's there."

Subliminal Messages: If You Say It Enough, It Will Be True

Changing the institutional culture into one that encourages, supports, and rewards faculty scholarship will take more than saying it is so, but saying it often enough, in the presence of the right people, can have a strong impact over time. And who says it and what those people believe and whether they are seen as scholars themselves are important aspects of changing the culture. A disconnect exists here: The two top-level instructional administrators, the heads of the faculty, are engaged in what may be termed traditional scholarship (publishing book chapters, articles, and such), yet only two faculty informants in this study expressed any knowledge of this. It is just not shared within this discourse community.

The fact that the instructional leaders do not present themselves as scholars to any extent is, perhaps, a mistake, given the following reaction

from the faculty. At this institution, the sense is, as one informant eloquently put it, that

> TT: [we need] leaders who are [committed to academia], not the good ol' boy system, [leaders] scholars could look up to as scholar[s], not a politician or someone who is in it for ego. You change the culture by respecting faculty. You've got to think it before it becomes real and say it enough times so people believe it. One of our administrators said recently that we have the best faculty in all the community colleges in the state. That got some snickers, but [he's made the right move, and] if he says it enough times, it'll become true; we'll rise to that.

During the focus group interview, participants joked that there had been a memo circulated to inform everyone that they were to use the terms teaching and learning as many times as possible. One participant called them "subliminal messages." The joke has some merit, though. As another participant noted, "the words have been attached to more things that come across our desks . . . those words have been given a higher place" in the culture of the institution. Again, if you say it enough, it becomes reality.

Scholarship is Like a Horse Drinking Water

An administrator compared the faculty to horses, metaphorically of course. We all know you can lead a horse to water but cannot make it drink, right? Well, apparently, you can lead community college faculty members to the ivory tower, but you cannot make them scholars. What this informant

actually said was this, and it is key to understanding the institution's position on the issues in this case:

> NN: Scholarship is like a horse drinking water; we can't force a faculty member to embrace the idea that he/she is a teacher first and a biologist second. The extent to which faculty recognize that teaching is a valuable, worthwhile vocation and want to engage in it will determine how much they do that. I think that as the institution recognizes that those are the kinds of things that we can invest in and make ourselves a better community college and serve our community better, those are where the resources are going to be. If faculty want to grow professionally, as scholars, I predict they will have to realize that they won't be able to develop scholarship in [their] discipline but [they] can become a better teacher. And the resources are there to become a better teacher, and if [they] do that, [they] can improve the institution and improve the world.

Scholarship is Icing on the Cake

Two informants used a cake metaphor in describing different aspects of community college scholarship. When it comes to hiring procedures for new faculty members; evidence of scholarship is not on the list of required qualifications. It is merely, as one informant put it, "icing on the cake." And in terms of faculty compensation and benefits, another informant saw additional funding for professional endeavors as merely icing. "What's going to set the climate for a scholarly endeavor," he submitted, "is a basic, solid level of compensation to start with. The rest is icing on the cake." What this

and other informants are getting at is the sense that community college faculty here are underpaid. This is an important issue in this state, one that the legislature is being asked to address this year. The faculty members in this system are one of the lowest paid community college faculties in the country. According to The Chronicle of Higher Education's 2000-2001 Almanac Issue, the national average salary of full-time faculty members at public institutions without rank is $43,389 while the average salary of faculty members at two-year public colleges in this state is $32,128. Given this situation, it is understandable how additional funding for professional development can be seen as little more than icing to faculty who are looking for more cake.

Choosing to Engage: A Fire Within

So, if faculty scholarship is not institutionally supported or rewarded in any systematic way, what has influenced the faculty members who are engaging in scholarly activities? The answer is partially related to whether the faculty member has been acculturated into the methods, language, and communicative competence of the larger discourse community. It is notable that the majority of the faculty members who emerged as informants in this case (suggested to me by their colleagues who perceived them as knowledgeable on this subject) have either completed or have been in the process of completing a doctoral degree. Many of the others who have completed the masters degree point to this experience as a source of their

abilities and interest in scholarship. It is as members of this larger discourse community that community college faculty often learn how to be scholars and learn to value scholarship. When asked what has influenced them to engage in scholarship, many informants referred to their graduate work or to "some great instructors who have given me a passion for [my discipline]. They lit a fire in me." "It's built into my doctoral program," said one informant; "my academic training," said another. Another offered this: "[I learned it in my] master's program; the professors were engaged, so I was sold that there is true value to that." Yet another said this: At universities "you get formal educational training; you have to deal with research . . . it's part of being a professional." Some faculty members came to the community college because they chose not to join in the "publish or perish" game at the university level: "I was trained to be a researcher, though I decided not to pursue it. I have a desire to present my discipline to students in a relevant way . . . scholarship allows me to do that." Some came because they see teaching as the best way to sustain scholarship and promote it among the college constituents, believing the universities to be elitist in what they determine to be scholarship and who they cultivate as scholars. "I abhor elitism; it eats away at higher education, so I don't want to draw a line saying that some people don't need to be engaged in knowing things at a deeper level . . . we probably don't make the culture a learning culture."

The most common responses had to do with a sense of self-fulfillment, personal interest, and commitment to being the best instructors they can be, improving their teaching, their programs, and the college as a whole. They engage in scholarship here because they are "desperately in love with [their] subject," or "want to be good at what [they] do." They feel they "have a responsibility" to their colleagues, to themselves, and to their students. They consider it "more a habit of being than an influence," "an innate drive that some folks have." "It's self-motivated." Most of them do it out of a "personal need" to improve their programs or their teaching abilities or to simply "keep from being embarrassed" about new information in the field; they have to keep up because many of their students are working in the field, using the newest technology and responding to current trends in the workplace.

Who Are Community College Scholars?

Scholarly Goat Herders, Scholarly Teachers

Throughout the data collection phase, informants wrestled with the questions "Who engages in scholarship here?" and "Who should engage in scholarship here?" The members of the focus group argued this point extensively, and, in individual interviews, additional informants talked in circles about it. Many participants were steadfast that "everyone, even the groundskeepers," should engage in scholarship. Others refuted this perception. Here is a rather comical reference offered by one faculty member when asked these questions:

> UU: Teaching is definitely a form of scholarship, a scholarly activity. Any distilling and imbuing knowledge is a scholarly activity, certainly an intellectual activity. Some of what we do is training, but it's more important to teach students how to learn than how to perform a skill. I think that's a scholarly activity. It's not digging ditches. There are different types of jobs and that's probably one of the less intellectual jobs out there.

Then, this line of discussion reminds him of the movie "Coming to America," the part where Eddie Murphy's character, a goat herder, quotes a philosopher extensively. When the other character asks him how he knows so much philosophy for a goat herder, he replies, "Well, the goats pretty much take care of themselves." Strangely enough, the line of thinking that reminded this informant of the scholarly goat herder had earlier taken the members of the focus group off onto a similarly long and winding digression, so I thought at the time. But the informant who was reminded of the intelligent goat herder and the informant whose comments I offer next were not present during the focus group interview. This informant walked down the same divergent path the focus group participants walked down so readily. He says, " . . . who am I to say the man cutting the grass shouldn't research better ways to do that here . . . it's absurd, but if he's making a contribution . . . we probably stand in his way, don't encourage him to study or apply all his knowledge . . ." As a scholar, I agree that the argument that everyone should be cultivated as a scholar is, indeed, absurd. As an ethical researcher attempting to provide an accurate view of the data, though, I do not quite know what to do with these

particular comments, except, as Diener and Crandall (1978) suggest, to offer them up for readers to draw their own conclusions.

Who Should; Who Does?

The informant's comment about the "man cutting the grass" to those of us who still think of scholarship in a traditional (perhaps, yes, elitist) sense may, indeed, seem absurd. This excerpt from the focus group interview illustrates the line of thinking the participants were engaged in:

> WW: There is a difference between scholarship and just doing a job. The guy cutting the lawn isn't engaged in scholarship. We hope he does it well, but it doesn't affect the academic integrity of the institution.
>
> ZZ: But if he doesn't have an awareness of what's going on in the buildings, it could inhibit what's going on inside the buildings.
>
> QQ: But that is having an awareness, not engaging in scholarship.
>
> WW: That's just doing your job effectively.
>
> ZZ: Work could be organized around what's going on in the classroom. . .
>
> QQ: I don't think that's scholarship; that's an understanding of the mission of the college. What do we need to do our job well?
>
> WW: If we broaden it, then everyone is engaged in scholarship.

Later, during his individual interview, the speaker marked "WW" above offered this reply to the question "Who should be engaged in scholarship here?": "Not the guy who cuts the lawn. Certainly faculty, administrators, students, the actual engaging and encouraging it in each other. The guy

cutting the lawn and the secretaries typing up a report are not engaged in scholarship; they are supporting the institution, but they are not furthering knowledge."

Overall, the faculty and administrators agreed, for the most part, that faculty, first, and professional staff, second, should be engaged in scholarship. One faculty member argued that "all faculty have an obligation to . . . keep up with what's going on and continue to learn so that they can share that knowledge with their students" while others argued that is should be based on self-motivation and a desire to improve. One University Transfer faculty member argued that "no one should have to formally engage in scholarship, frankly because it's not required. Should they have the opportunity to do it? Yes." One instructional administrator responds to this question from the perspective of the institution's culture, which hinges on the value of teaching and learning. He says,

> NN: Given the Scholarship of Teaching definition [Lee Shulman's definition; see Appendix D], that's certainly something that our faculty and instructional administrators should be a part of and buy into in order for us to be an effective institution. It benefits us; it behooves faculty to stay current in their disciplines as well. I guess also, back to this notion of a university community as one in which scholarship is passed on from faculty to student, I think that's harbored here, and I think it's less important. It doesn't permeate the institutional ethos . . . It's less important

here, but it is an important aspect of who should be engaged in scholarship.

Who should and who is engaged in scholarship here are very different questions. As it turns out, this second question (Who is?) was a difficult question for participants to answer. Many simply said, "I don't know." Others named a few colleagues they might be close to or have heard from in departmental meetings or at campus-wide events, and then they shrugged their shoulders. They typically don't know when someone in another area of the college is engaged in scholarly activities. The problem is that there is no systematic way of sharing information about who is engaged in what kind of activity. There is an internal publication disseminated on campus where faculty and staff can read about someone who has attended or presented at a conference, won an award, perhaps published something. But not everything is printed there, and not everyone sees this publication as a vehicle to share such information. Faculty members might know about "people who are public about it" or, for some, "it's more intuition than actual knowing." Many informants agree with this University Transfer instructor's assessment: "We should be doing a better job of disseminating this, at the same time, you have to have a very clear idea that it is important to do it, that that energizes the campus, [and] that it is not just showing off, but it would take the culture of the campus to change."

The Importance of Scholarship:

Separating the Peas from the Pod?

The fact is, as both the administrators and the faculty members remind me, that the community college does not have a research mission, and many people see a traditional definition of scholarship as being tied to research. According to one upper-level administrator, "faculty who pursue their own research ideas or agendas are doing so out of a personal interest in that, and the institution may derive some benefit from that, but it's not institutionally sponsored, and it's not essential for the institution to do its job." The perceived importance of scholarship here depends on the definition being used. If the definition does not prescribe that one engage in research for publication, the answer is, unequivocally, "it's crucial." The faculty believe they would be "stagnant if [they] didn't," that their "teaching would lack integrity," and that it's "a matter of survival." The following exchange between one informant and me sums up one typical view among the faculty here:

> CKK: How important is it that community college faculty engage in scholarship?
> RR: Not very important that every person engages; there is no obligation at the community college. So, I don't see it as critically important . . . But I think that one thing that distinguishes quality instruction is a culture that accepts, acknowledges, takes an interest in scholarship. At some point, you can distinguish institutions based on how they respond to scholarship.

> CKK: And how would you distinguish [this college] in that sense?
> RR: I'm going to guess that we're somewhere in the middle. But I think we have a trend now. Certainly twelve years ago people did not talk about publishing or engaging in the process. You didn't have the kind of faculty meetings we have today. You didn't have these kinds of presentations.
> CKK: What changed?
> RR: I think the people are what changed. We've had a very significant change in personnel, both faculty and administration, but the more important change has been in the faculty. I think there are more people now . . . the new, larger University Transfer faculty tend to be more interested in scholarship; that's a very positive change.

What is especially interesting about these comments is that the university transfer mission was not added here until just fourteen years ago, and that is when the name changed from "technical institute" to "technical community college." The University Transfer Department has grown tremendously and, very recently, took the General Education Department under its umbrella. Whether these changes will continue to affect community college scholarship in a positive way, as RR suggests they have in the past, will be interesting to watch.

One University Transfer faculty member argues that scholarship is "going to make the difference between the survival of the community colleges and having them go under." He believes that "programs where individual faculty engage and are supported in their engagement in improving their

abilities and skills and keeping current will survive. Those who don't will lose credibility; when word gets out to potential students and employers, they'll go under." Another University Transfer faculty member worries about whether faculty who do not engage in scholarship can adequately prepare students for their experiences at the university level.

> MM: To me, it's a part of my growth and development intellectually. It keeps [me] alive, motivates, makes [me] think critically, organize ideas. If we're sending students to universities, we have to take that challenge very seriously. We have an obligation to our students and college to keep standards that are equivalent. In reality, what they are going to find at universities.

A Public Services faculty member sees the importance of engaging in scholarship from more of an internal perspective. As she says, "we can be our own best resources, especially some of the senior faculty members. I'm amazed at the level of engagement of our faculty." Another faculty member from this area of the college calls for more support from the administration when a faculty member expresses an interest in engaging in scholarship. "I don't feel that's the case right now," he says, "and I think that by not pursuing it faculty become very stagnant in their teaching methodology, in their course materials, in how they approach and explain concepts to students." He follows this later with the assertion that "that's what community colleges are here for, so you never stop learning, no matter what age you are." He adds, "I think the faculty should be in learning mode, engaging in scholarship,

improving themselves, which would improve the college." As yet another faculty member puts it, "without [scholarship], you can't present relevant material. You can't present your discipline as an active, living thing." Yet another faculty member sums it up succinctly; "it's what separates the peas from the pod," he says.

Examples of Community College Scholarship

Coming to any clear definition of the term scholarship in this case has proved to be beyond the scope of this study. That truth became abundantly clear to me as I asked informants what they do that they consider to be a form of scholarship. Much of what they detailed to me would not pass muster within academe, using traditional definitions of the term. However, as I was continually trying to remind myself during this study, this is not a university; there is, as of now, no faculty rank. There is little institutionalized incentive for the faculty to engage in scholarship as it is traditionally defined within academe. As you will see, there are faculty members doing just that, engaging in traditional scholarship. More prevalent, though, are faculty members engaging in various forms of faculty development and professional development activities. Whether these activities should be considered valid forms of a new kind of community college scholarship, yet to be clearly defined, is up for discussion.

Informants were asked the following two questions, designed to solicit examples of faculty scholarship: "What are some examples of scholarship that

are evident among community college administrators and faculty at [this college]?" and "What do you do that you consider to be a form of scholarship?" The most typical answers to these questions are (arguably) in line with the traditional definitions of the term scholarship. They are as follows:

- publishing an article, a book chapter, a book review, a lab manual, short stories, or a textbook;
- serving as an editor of a publication;
- actively participating (presenting) at a conference or seminar;
- doing research; and
- maintaining one's skills and expertise, staying current in one's discipline (which may include graduate studies or return to industry activities).

Other responses cited more college-related activities, which may be less in line with the traditional definitions, they include activities such as

- creating and teaching a new course;
- integrating disciplines through collaboration of faculty (for example, including topics in anthropology in a history course, and vice versa) ;
- redesigning curricula;
- exploring new methodologies and sharing with colleagues;
- creating and submitting a teaching portfolio for peer review as a part of the Excellence in Teaching Award process; and
- participating in the Teaching and Learning Center's Conversations on Learning seminars.

Readers may note that many of the examples given by informants are more likely to be considered examples of professional development activities than examples of scholarship. However, informants did not tend to

differentiate on that basis; as a researcher and scholar, I do note the difference and see the informants' comments as but another symptom of the lack of clarity that exists in defining scholarship in this setting. Rather than attempt to make arguments for or against these examples in terms of their validity as scholarship from my personal definition or those offered in current literature, I offer the readers a series of arguments from the informants themselves and ask that readers come to their own conclusions as to whether the arguments are sufficient. The discussions below are from a series of faculty members, representing the University Transfer Department (PP, QQ, VV, and WW), General Education area (TT), Public Services Department (RR and UU), and Health Technologies Department (YY). These are excerpts from their individual interviews with me (CKK), and so may appear a bit disjointed in their presentation:

> PP: When I bring it back, when it enhances my teaching and my knowledge of the subject, when it helps me to start to think about things in a different way, [it's scholarship]. I think professional development provides the opportunity for scholarship to take place.
> QQ: I am involved in textbook writing; I like that. I think that for me that is the best combination of . . . research and teaching, actually disseminating and putting to use what you've been researching . . . When I am writing a textbook, I get everything that I need; I [write] with three colleagues, so we have the exchange of ideas that I love; we have all been teaching for a long time, so we know what we should have in the classroom . . . The textbook is working, and I consider that scholarship. But in

academia if you are a textbook writer, you are not really a researcher . . . it's applied.

VV: In terms of trying to educate ourselves, I think a lot of us spend a great deal of time doing that. Graduate school doesn't prepare us to teach broad courses; it prepares us to do research in a specialized field. All of us spend our time trying to improve ourselves. How do you make [the content] comprehensible; how do you make sure students get something out of it? That's where scholarship comes into it.

QQ: The fact that we have the Conversations on Learning, that is a way to share scholarship. Again, I think the next step for a scholar is to go beyond your classroom and your colleagues, really being out there sharing your ideas. [Many faculty members here feel that they] couldn't go into [their] discipline conference and present about how to teach. Many of them feel that what they have to offer is not scholarly, when really that is a matter of choosing the right conference.

WW: I do individual research . . . I'm adding to the discipline . . . People are interested in what I have to say; they don't care how I got there. [I share] at conferences and through articles and essays I've written. I'll also take that information and apply it to the classroom, with my students. So, I'm not just sharing it with the ivory tower individuals, but I'm also using that information to enhance what I teach in the classroom.

CKK: Who are you communicating to when you are writing these articles and essays?

WW: People who are interested in my specific research. Mostly university individuals and retired independent scholars.

TT: I reflect at the end of the semester, print [my thoughts] out and send them to my colleagues in my area. I participate in an on-line discussion forum with five or six of my colleagues at other institutions [on the east coast]. We try to become better teachers, better human beings. I present at conferences, summarize conference sessions and share the summaries with colleagues who did not attend. [I am] monitoring how the introduction of technology in the classroom is improving learning, if it is. We are collecting informal data about retention, preparation of students, grades. My colleagues are constantly assessing how things are going in the classroom. Faculty are involved in self-evaluation.
RR: I'm trying to work on some publications (book review, article) . . . [scholarship involves] familiarity with the literature, submit[ting] to selective publications, wrestling with issues, analysis, reflection.
CKK: When does that become scholarship?
RR: Oh, that's hard. I mean, that's a difficult question. I think there are two ways to look at it -- number one, when the individual thinks it's scholarship, number two, when the community thinks it's scholarship. I wouldn't say that as individuals we control that. Probably what's more important is what our community says, what [this college] says. I can imagine that there are people doing things here that most of us would say, oh, yes, that's scholarship, that's important, we value it, we encourage people to do it. It may not be consistent with a definition of scholarship at other institutions, at universities, so I think it's dependent on the context, on the community.
UU: We have some folks who take part in the traditional form of scholarship, publish articles in journals that are peer reviewed. We have people participating in conferences and workshops where

they are contributing what they've learned about teaching and about their content to their peers, so that's a kind of peer review, of sharing. We have local workshops where we share what we've accomplished in our field . . . Some of us try experimental things in the classroom and we reflect at the end of the semester, summarizing the experience, considering what worked and what didn't work.

YY: I have a particular faculty member on my staff . . . [whom] I see as a good example of scholarship and teaching, taking some research that she had read and put it together with application. She has refined it over the years, and now the next part of it will be that she'll publish, at least via her dissertation, what she has learned.

CKK: What is it before she publishes it?

YY: I think that what she's been doing all along is scholarship. She doesn't have to publish it in that format. We all know about it because she shares that information with us. I think of myself . . . every time I teach that subject, I'm back into the library, I'm back into the tools, finding out what's new, what's different . . . I consider that to be scholarship. I think of the work that [two other instructors] did with supplemental instruction; they had good outcomes.

CKK: If they were poor outcomes, is it still scholarship?

YY: Yeah, I think so; you can learn a lot from your mistakes and from your successes.

Impediments

Almost every informant quickly responded, "Time!" when asked what may impede a community college faculty member from engaging in

scholarship. A close runner-up was "teaching load and administrative duties," which boils down to the issue of time as well. Many participants cited faculty burnout and lack of exposure, interest, or motivation as impediments. In addition, a number of informants viewed the lack of funding, lack of recognition, and, at times, family obligations as impediments they have experienced. One respondent used the term inertia often when discussing the issues in this case. She perceived some faculty members as being afraid of engaging in scholarship. "The threat of finding out you're not doing a very good job, exposing yourself to others and inviting criticism is intimidating . . . and sometimes you don't want to rock the boat that way, and you just want to quietly improve things," she says. Other informants pointed to the lack of a committee review structure to support and oversee faculty research and to the history of the institution as impediments. Regarding the history of the institution, an instructor offered this: "Our history is an obstacle -- the mindset of many people who have been here a long time -- [they] might believe that our role is purely technical; they fail to see that our role has changed and expanded."

While ignorance of the procedures for applying for professional development funding was not given as an impediment, the following exchange between the researcher (CKK) and one faculty member (XX) is telling:

> CKK: How might funding affect people's attitude about scholarship?

> XX: If each department got $500 per year for professional development, that would be a good idea and would promote scholarship. [A world-wide meeting in my discipline] happens every two years [in Chicago]. I've never been, but they have the most modern things that have come out in your [area].
> CKK: What stops you from going? You can put in a request to the Professional Development Committee for funding.
> XX: I don't know how to do that.
> CKK: Ask [your supervisor or the departmental secretary] to help you. I'm sure they'd fund that.
> XX: Yeah. I'd like to see those new [kinds of equipment] being used. Yeah. Where would I be without [the departmental secretary]?

There was mention of, in most interviews, the new role that the Teaching and Learning Center might assume, a role of promoting and facilitating faculty scholarship and professional development. There truly is a need for the new Teaching and Learning Center here; whether faculty will actually use the Center and whether it lives up to its mission and meets its goals remains to be seen.

When asked how funding might affect instructors' attitudes about engaging in scholarship, informants reiterated the key impediments: time, teaching load, and administrative duties. They tended to believe that additional funding would, indeed, "increase the amount of scholarship" and "increase institutional awareness of it." Specifically, though, their wish list included funding for release time to engage in scholarship ("If I got release

time, I'd be so happy; I think that lots of people want to do lots of things, I really do"), funding for tuition reimbursement for faculty who want to continue their education ("I think [more people] would be interested in starting [a doctoral] program if [they] had financial help . . . I wanted mine, so I paid for it myself"), and funding for scholarly endeavors undertaken during the summer months ("I wish some of them could be paid during the summer to pursue scholarship"). One note of caution from the administration, though, centered on the need for clear outcomes and sharing of the scholarship if the institution were to invest in faculty members' scholarship. The level of funding for professional development of the faculty is seen as directly tied to the institution's interest in and support of the faculty; however, as one administrator put it, the college "is a creature of the state" and the rhetoric at this college is that the college has often limited control over its resources.

Promoting Community College Scholarship

While a couple of faculty members felt they could not promote scholarship within the college, most respondents thought they did so. Full-time faculty members cited more informal ways than faculty members who also serve as administrators did. For instance, full-time faculty members said they attend workshops and sharing sessions when they are offered, so they can support each other and learn from one another. They share articles and article summaries with other faculty members, encourage others to pursue more education and to attend or present at conferences, and share what they

learn about each other's accomplishments with other faculty members, when an opportunity arises. The faculty members who act as supervisors cited the institutional performance review and evaluation process as aiding them in promoting faculty scholarship. "On the PR+E, I encourage all my faculty to participate in any scholarly endeavor . . . write it down as a goal for the year and then review it . . ." explained one supervisor. In addition to the PR+E, other supervisors promote scholarship by helping faculty members find conferences and workshops, arranging for release time, accommodating the schedules of faculty members who are writing dissertations and taking courses, sending information to the college marketing office for publication in campus-wide print materials, and "mak[ing] phone calls if there are road blocks within the college." They "tell [faculty members that they] are proud of them." As one supervisor says,

> QQ: It is encouragement, but it is not institutional recognition. It happens internally, and I try to make [the faculty] understand that what they do in the classroom is scholarship . . . and they need to disseminate, and they need to share. In our department [University Transfer] it is important that professors at universities see us as being engaged in scholarship . . . Sometimes that is not easy because of this traditional definition -- you are just teachers; what kind of scholarship are you involved in -- we face that all the time.

One upper-level academic administrator in particular is seen as promoting scholarship among the faculty; this person is understood as being responsible

for bringing "a lot of interest about scholarship to [this college]." And it is anticipated that "decisions that have been made will affect scholarship in a positive way."

Rewarding Community College Scholarship

The predominant sense among the informants is that scholarship is not rewarded or even recognized in any systematic way here. At times, one's involvement might be mentioned in a meeting or printed in a campus publication, but those things happen haphazardly. Some informants have the perception that one's scholarship might play a role in whether he or she is chosen for leadership positions or given additional duties on campus, perhaps even promotions, but this, too, is not systematic. The two institutional awards given to faculty who exhibit scholarly behavior as educators were noted by almost every informant but then quickly clarified as being "not necessarily for scholarship" or "too much trouble to apply for." Faculty members appreciate their peers and supervisors who "give lots of strokes." As one Health Tech faculty member put it,

> LL: there are selected people on campus who really appreciate scholarship and really enjoy it and who will be there to reinforce you for it . . . But [for the awards], you have to put your own portfolio together and ask for it yourself . . . It would be nice [to have someone else recognize you]. The piece missing is that you have to be willing to raise your own flag. That's not supportive; I don't think that really makes you feel good. Often, non-scholarship is just as supported as scholarship. Around here, I

> really do feel that you've got to feel good about yourself or you aren't going to continue to do it because there is no strong reinforcement system.

In looking to the future, though, one administrator and faculty member offered this: " I've tried to encourage the culture in a certain direction, so I'm going to be hopeful and say that we are leaning towards the fact that scholarship will be recognized and appreciated."

Current Changes -- Future Trends

Five overall categories emerged from the data regarding changes that have or will affect the nature of faculty scholarship here. They are (1) the move from a quarter system to a semester system, promoting transferability of courses and programs; (2) increased accountability measures from the system level and the state legislators; (3) increased use of instructional technology; (4) college-level organizational changes, merging General Education with University Transfer into a new Arts, Sciences, and University Transfer Department; and (5) a commitment to the new Teaching and Learning Center to support faculty development.

A couple of years ago, the college moved from a quarter system to a semester system; in fact, all the community colleges in the state did so, and they created a common course library across all community colleges in the state. One outcome of this is that the courses are more in line with the courses taught during the freshman and sophomore years at the state universities. Another, perhaps unintentional, outcome noted by one informant

was that the process of coming to consensus regarding course descriptions created an opportunity for community college faculty across the state to "look at each other's stuff, a chance to talk with each other as educators." On the other hand, having a common course library can be seen as overly rigid and might be hindering faculty creativity.

More than half of the informants saw what they called the "legislative mandates," "benchmarks," "accountability measures," "performance funding," and "push to quantify" in a similar light. While they agree that such requirements spur the faculty and administration into action, they question the basis upon which the standards have been set, the purpose and the accuracy of the measures, and the methods for determining additional funding. On the positive side, some faculty see this change as being the impetus for faculty and staff to "look critically at what we're doing and to ask ourselves some difficult questions about whether what we do works. That's a good thing." Two informants were cautious that faculty egos will impede this process and offered that additional tools are needed to do a good job, including "software [from the system level] so we can collect data more efficiently." One of these faculty members added this: "I have some intuitive views, but now we'll be looking at more concrete evidence . . . looking at outcomes is going to force . . . some changes . . . I see it as a natural progression." The dissenters, one dean (ZZ) and one program director (YY), had this to say about the mandates:

> ZZ: Money is dedicated by the states to equipment and technology and that's not necessarily promoting scholarship. On the face of it, the benchmark requirements look like scholarship, but they're not. They are haphazardly developed and ill-formed, so what is dressed up in scholarship clothing is really not scholarship. That is driving administrators to ask for more data that is not scholarly but is number crunching. I think overall the drive in the US to quantify everything including learning has an impact on scholarship.
>
> YY: [Some negative changes are] the legislative mandates that are looking at measuring outcomes that may not necessarily be measuring scholarship. I think the mandates will change what we can teach because we have to meet that outcome.

Increased use of instructional technology, almost exclusively, was seen as a positive change here. In terms of how technology might effect changes in the faculty members' interest and ability in engaging in scholarship, one informant felt strongly that it has had a positive effect. He said, "technology . . . has encouraged some people who may not have engaged in scholarship to engage . . . [and] having everyone networked (email, Internet access) makes it more likely that people will engage in scholarship. For the folks who are borderline, being networked will make them more likely to engage in scholarship." Another faculty member feels that "how [we] engage in scholarship will change (because of technology); it'll change where we go and how we share. There will [also] be new opportunities to augment the classes."

A notable change at the college was announced to the campus community during the data collection phase of this study, and the informants were grappling with what impact the change would have on scholarship. The announcement detailed a restructuring of the academic departments to bring all the general education courses and university transfer courses under the same umbrella on the staffing and organizational charts. While other faculty members neglected to mention this change, all but one of the University Transfer faculty members discussed it extensively. Response to this change was quite favorable among the informants in the University Transfer Department, with some minor dissention in their ranks. Many of them saw the merger as an opportunity for collaboration with colleagues. A humanities instructor expects to "be rejuvenated by being grouped with colleagues in a discipline. More contact might create competition. It'll increase communication and discourse and create more collaboration in the classroom; we'll inspire each other." But a science instructor worried that it would "make it harder to communicate and cause more conflict." "Maybe it's not so good . . . I don't want the courses to be mellowed down," she pondered. There was a call from yet another university transfer faculty member to "make a special effort to reflect on scholarship that is useful and meaningful to our faculty and students . . . the move to change the programs will have an overall positive impact." The University Transfer Department is seen, by its faculty, as being "instrumental in this greater emphasis on scholarship" here. As one

administrator put it, this department is "forced to act as if we are a two-year liberal arts college; we have to answer to the four-year institutions. Many of us have [doctoral degrees] and bring with us research training. [With more and more students choosing to transfer], we will start to think now of transfer for all students in all programs." A full-time faculty member in the department agreed, arguing that the "traditional view of community colleges as technical schools is outdated . . . the UT takeover of GenEd is an indication of this . . . for years, [this department] was seen as elitist and so on; I think we're getting past that."

According to one of the instructional administrators interviewed in this study, the "emergence of teaching as scholarship, the notion of learning-based institutions, has enabled the picture of the scholarship of teaching to emerge and be prominent. Part of that is assessment . . . a greater sense of accountability." While the "teaching and learning buzz" has permeated the culture here, some informants question whether the language has "affected management decisions." Others note a change in the air and are hopeful that the faculty can move the work of the Teaching and Learning Center forward. One University Transfer faculty member put it this way:

> QQ: I think there is a more friendly environment regarding teaching and learning, increased awareness, the fact that people are talking about it. When you bring an issue to the campus and you make it the issue of the faculty, it has potential. The fact

that there are small functions where people are recognized [for their scholarship] is a positive change.

Final Comments from Informants and Researcher

The faculty members were asked two final questions about engaging in scholarship. The first, "How would you feel about being asked to engage in scholarship for merit pay or promotion?" elicited very strong positive responses and a few equally as strong negative responses. Some of the faculty who were interviewed felt that they were engaging in scholarly activities already, that to ask them to engage in scholarship for merit pay or promotion would imply a lack of understanding of what they do already (four faculty members responded in this manner). Two others expressed the same sentiment, yet they did so with a more positive spin; they saw it as recognition of what they are doing and would be "delighted" that they "could spend more time on it," with the institution's blessing. Overall, nineteen out of the twenty-three faculty members responded with enthusiasm. In addition to the above comments, they replied with a simple, "no problem," "that would be marvelous," or "that'd be a large motivating factor for me." Others saw it as "beneficial for morale" and suggested more use of the teaching portfolio, arguing that it is "a way of demonstrating the process of scholarship that you've been through more than anything." Another suggestion was that it would be nice to "have our own in-house [or system level] publishing . . . our own journal and people were given release time or merit pay for that." On

the flip side, one faculty member referred back to the mission, still arguing that "it's not our mission. Our mission is to train the workforce, to teach students; that's where we fit in to higher education . . . you can't do both." This respondent, and the other dissenters, were still grappling with the issue of definition. They were concerned about how such a request would be stated and who would be evaluating their scholarship. They called for clearer definitions, specific guidelines, and a commitment to balance between their teaching duties and other duties. Here are two examples from faculty members with strong opinions on this topic:

> VV: That doesn't bother me at all as long as I'm comfortable with what that means and how this is being evaluated. If that gets translated into I have to publish things, then you've got a choice. You can either have me spend time focusing on teaching or you can have me publishing articles and doing research, but the two don't necessarily go hand-in-hand. We have to be clear about what we mean by scholarship.
>
> WW: I already engage in it, and how dare you critique me on that basis, and who is going to be a capable judge of what scholarly activities I'm engaged in? If you need a monetary incentive to engage in what you supposedly love to begin with, then you really should be looking for another job. If I'm going to do scholarship only because I'm going to get money for it, I'm a prostitute, of sorts.

The last question was similar yet more concrete (and, as it turned out, elicited more negative responses). I asked, "How would you feel about being

required to engage in scholarship as a part of your job description?" The word required caused resentment from some, one person arguing that you can't "legislate imagination and creativity." The issue of the need for balance between teaching duties and scholarly duties came out very clearly here. A few informants worried that then "we wouldn't be a community college; we'd be a university." "If it moves closer to what we find at the universities," said one faculty member, "then, no. That's why I left. We need a more balanced approach." Those informants on the positive side felt that they were already required to engage in scholarship, "in a manner of speaking." In terms of the institutional culture supporting such a requirement explicitly, most informants felt that the institution was not ready for such a move. One faculty member said,"It may be in my job description [already, but] Satan will be skating to work on that day [when scholarship is truly valued here] in terms of the institutional culture." However, there is a disparity on job descriptions, which may be interesting to note. First, there is no clear uniformity in the statements in job descriptions although many of them use similar language. On some faculty members' job descriptions, there is an item that states the faculty member is expected to be "taking advantage of in-service training and other opportunities for continued professional development, including attendance at off-campus activities, as feasible, and generally staying abreast of developments in the field of instruction." However, there is no such statement on many administrators' job descriptions; instead, they include

statements like the administrator (including some program directors) will "provide for the professional development needs of all departmental faculty and staff" or simply "participate in appropriate professional organizations . . ." The term scholarship is does not appear on any job descriptions in the context of faculty engaging in scholarly activities. The term professional development does occur, however, on many.

At the outset of this chapter, the question of terminology was key. As I said, the institution seems to use two other terms more freely to refer to much of what Vaughan (1988) called for in this section of his definition of scholarship (the definition the faculty informants had the least argument with of the three presented to them):

> Scholarship is the umbrella under which research falls, for research is but one form of scholarship. . . Scholarship requires that one have a solid foundation in one's professional field and that one keep up with the developments in that field (p. 27).

The terms used at this institution are faculty development (used infrequently) and professional development (used extensively). The culture of this institution, its perceived future direction in relation to faculty professional development, and the informants' catalog of institutional weaknesses in this case support the claims made by Quehl, Bergquist, and Subbiondo (1999). Their findings show that that a successful faculty development program must

have three components. It must have "structures within the college or university to support the faculty growth and development (e.g., evaluation, reward systems, leave policies)." It must have "a focus on the process in which faculty members engage (e.g., teaching, advising, scholarly research)." And it must have faculty members whose attitudes "complement the structures of the institution and the processes in which faculty participate" (p. 41). This institution's new Teaching and Learning Center could be seen as a step in the right direction, toward a clear structure, and the current method of demonstrating excellence among the faculty by requiring teaching portfolios is seen already. At this time, however, communication of expectations and guidelines for evaluation of one's professional development activities are left up to individual supervisors (using the Performance Review and Evaluation tool) and to small campus committees or other groups who determine awards for faculty based on guidelines specific to the particular award.

The account of current needed changes in structure among colleges and universities offered by Quehl, Bergquist, and Subbiondo (1999) fit nicely with the perceived reality of faculty scholarship and direction of the institution in this case study. These authors credit Boyer for creating a liminal space within academe, a space where new priorities can emerge and be negotiated. "New evaluation procedures are needed -- the portfolio approach being among the most promising," they say. "There is also a need for new ways to

thoughtfully and systematically plan for the diversity of faculty development services that are required to encompass the diverse realms of faculty scholarship -- the professional growth/development contract being of particular merit" (p. 41). At the college in this case study, the new Performance Review and Evaluation forms now include a section where employees must write their professional development goals, and these goals are discussed between the employee and his/her supervisor mid-year and at the end of the year. Many faculty members in this study referred to this practice as a way of promoting and rewarding their and other's scholarly activities, although this language is not universal here. Another informant had recently completed a teaching portfolio to be submitted for consideration during the Excellence in Teaching Award deliberations. He had this to say in his self-reflection section:

> SS: Am I a perfect instructor? No . . . nor will I ever be; but I shall strive for perfection, and this striving is a monumental characteristic of excellence in any profession. We often argue about the process-product debate. Although the quality of the product is important, it is the process or experience from which we learn the most. I did not learn about my profession just by reviewing what or who I produce, but how I produced it or them. The same philosophy applies to the development of this professional teaching portfolio. I am thankful for the experience, and I can literally share the experience with others now.

In discussing the importance of faculty scholarship within community colleges, one faculty member became critical and empowered. Her comments synthesize the various opportunities, obligations, and emotions evident in the data. I offer her comments for your consideration as a closing to this chapter. She says,

> QQ: I think we are part of the situation of putting down community colleges because we don't fit in the traditional definition of scholarship. I think we are responsible for being heard and being considered as serious institutions where scholarship takes place. And I think that going to presentations, interacting with people, publishing if you can, we can all change that image. I don't say this to make community colleges look like universities. I think that in every area, we are the ones responsible for changing that image. I know I have to go through long explanations to my professors [at the university], to explain why I'm here. [They say] you have so much potential, what are you doing at a community college? And it takes me then to go to the conferences where they are, present what we are doing, and show them what we are about, and immediately they recognize that what we are doing is worthy. And actually some good things are going on in the community college. I truly believe that we create and we define who we are at [this college]. And I think it is our responsibility to change that image.

CHAPTER FIVE: Implications

This Study's Contribution

As I completed the data collection phase of my research, I stumbled on a chapter in a book entitled *A Handbook on the Community College in America,* written by James Palmer, a scholar who has spent much time, thought, and ink exploring the topic of community college faculty scholarship. This chapter came as a surprise to me, because I thought I had been thorough in my reading of his work but had somehow overlooked this piece until I was getting ready to compile my own findings for this case study. Upon reading Palmer's 1994 chapter reviewing the research on faculty attitudes and practices in the arenas of teaching and disciplinary scholarship, I found myself struck by the similarities of what he reported then and what I was finding as significant themes in my data. In 1994, Palmer wrote that community college faculties consist of an "active minority" who take a professional initiative to "make notable contributions to instructional practice and engage in . . .scholarly work" and that the institutional culture of community colleges, in fact, "stymie the professional initiatives of the remaining faculty" (p. 424). And, just when I was beginning to wonder about the nagging question, "So What?" of my qualitative research, I read Palmer's plea that such studies continue to be conducted to allow for future possibilities that, viewed together, ethnographic

studies may allow for generalizations of their findings to community colleges as a whole (p. 431).

In his plea, Palmer (1994) demands that further research be done regarding community college faculty scholarship, pointing to the following trends, which he argues will make an "aborted nature of faculty professionalism . . . untenable in the future":

- an increased demand for curricular reform and assessment of student learning,
- growing debates about the nature of scholarship within academe,
- greater acceptance of the need for community college faculty to be scholars within their disciplines,
- awareness of the link between teaching and scholarship, and
- the growing need for community college faculty to introduce their students to the communicative competence and the nature of inquiry found within the larger discourse community, as more and more students look to the community college as their first step into the community of higher education (p. 432-433).

The connections between his tone, his language, and his insights into the nature of community college faculty attitudes and the conclusions I was coming to in my study were undeniable. This realization took me by surprise; I found myself conflicted as a researcher. At once, I felt both legitimized and defeated. On one hand, I thought, this chapter lends strong corroboration

and validation to my findings. On the other hand, the explorer in me was disappointed that much of what I spent such long hours interviewing and transcribing and analyzing was less than ground-breaking news.

An important contribution made by my study, in addition to validating much of the arguments made by Palmer in the past, is its offering of an explanation of why this community college might seem to have a culture that does not foster faculty scholarship. The answer lies in the fundamental question of identity. As the administration argues, faculty must identify first and foremost with their personae as educators. Typically, community college faculty members see traditional scholarship occurring within one's discipline, so faculty are left with a choice. If they wish to engage in scholarship within their disciplines, they do so on their own time, of their own volition, without being sanctioned or rewarded by the institution. If, however, they wish to engage in scholarly activity directly related to their work as educators, their scholarship might, indeed, be supported and even rewarded in some non-systematic manner at the community college. The problem, here, is that most faculty members are not equipped with the knowledge, interest, or support to engage in scholarship of this sort. They may see themselves as educators first and foremost yet have little incentive or interest in engaging in what truly is, for most, perceived as uncharted waters within academe.

While this case study is informative and offers some new perspectives, I've determined that the connections in the research are what we are after.

My limited case study cannot profess to be generalizable to other community colleges, but, as Palmer suggests, it does make a valuable contribution to the growing literature on this subject, and I respectfully submit it as such.

Opportunities for Further Research

Additional qualitative studies regarding community college scholarship are warranted, I believe. While some of my findings are in concert with the findings of researchers like James Palmer, I find great value in looking at the issues related to faculty scholarship from an emic perspective. This treatment leads to a different, perhaps richer, understanding of the nature of community college scholarship than has been presented in the literature.

Implications for Community Colleges

Given the current flow of discourse within higher education on the topic of scholarship and given that those who are looked to as having the power to name "what is" and to manipulate "what is" are now turning their attention to the redefinition of the term scholarship, I submit that faculty members in higher education find themselves in the midst of a liminal space, as Bowers (1987) describes it. We are in a liminal space, an opening, where definitions are open to interpretation, where the power to name is up for grabs. If community college faculty wish to, now is the time to assert their power within academe, to use the communicative competence they have acquired as members of the larger discourse community to create a stronger, more valued discourse community of their own.

Once the cultural hegemony is questioned, once beliefs and constructs are "made explicit and examined in a critical manner, they lose their traditional hold on us" (Bowers, 1987, p. 6). This ability of our society to allow for negotiation of ideology and meaning creates opportunity for our cultural reproduction to be halted or altered. Bowers explains that "as taken-for-granted beliefs are made explicit and are challenged, there is a moment in social and conceptual time when the individual experiences the temporary openness of liminal space . . . [at this time] new definitions can be presented, and the conceptual foundations of authority renegotiated" (1987, p. 6-7). The role of discourse, within this liminal space, is political; individuals who have communicative competence are presented with an opportunity to define reality on their terms.

Community college faculty and instructional administrators must continue to grapple with the issues dealt with in this case. Without coming to a clear understanding of the nature of scholarship within their own discourse community, they cannot move toward valuing their work themselves, and they cannot be advocates for themselves and their institutions for renewed value within the larger community. We can develop our communicative competence through professional development activities; we can celebrate ourselves within our discourse community and work to legitimize our roles within higher education. Valuing our scholarship, encouraging scholarly endeavors among our faculty, pushing our faculty to take the extra steps necessary for their

work to be accepted as scholarship, is key. Community colleges can, if they choose, create their own commitment to their own definition of scholarship, one that the faculty and administration sees as integral to their mission.

Community colleges must define scholarship for themselves and then make an institutional commitment to encourage it, support it, and reward it. Community college faculty members must not wait to be invited to participate as equal partners within academe they must foster their own and each other's communicative competence and assert themselves. While the existing literature regarding the nature of community college scholarship paints a bleak picture, I have found the perspectives of the informants in this case study, ultimately, to be encouraging to me as a researcher who sees great value and potential for community college scholarship on the horizon.

Recommended Practices

A community college wishing to engage its faculty and administrative staff in scholarship must create an institutional culture that values scholarship, one that supports, promotes, and rewards individuals who choose to engage. The following practices are recommended as guidelines for creating just such a culture:

1. **Define** the term scholarship within the context of your institution. This process may take the form of adopting an existing definition offered in the literature, refining one that currently exists, or creating a new definition.

2. **Promote** scholarship among the faculty and administrative staff. Include an expectation of scholarly work on job descriptions and on performance evaluations.
3. **Support** faculty and staff in their scholarly endeavors. This support must be institutionalized; do not rely on an informal culture of support. An individual's scholarly activities, under the adopted definition, must be sanctioned by the institution in every way.
4. **Provide** opportunities for faculty and staff to develop or refine their communicative competence and join in the scholarly discourse.
5. **Share** the scholarship generated by the faculty and staff within the institution and beyond. Celebrate the accomplishments of your scholars.
6. **Reward** faculty and staff who engage in scholarly work. Institutional awards and recognition programs should use quality scholarship as part of their criteria for selection.
7. **Evaluate** institutional policies and procedures to ensure that they do not impede faculty and administrative staff members' ability to engage in scholarly work.
8. **Commit** to a culture that values scholarship. Walk the walk; talk the talk.

References

Bizzell, P. (1982). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community. Curriculum Inquiry, 12, 191-207.

Bizzell, P. (1992). Academic discourse and critical consciousness. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Blasi, A. J., Dasilva, F. B. & Weigert, A. J. (1978). Toward an interpretive Sociology. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Bogden, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1998). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogue, J. P. (1950). The community college. NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Bowers, C. A. (1987). The promise of theory: Education and the politics of cultural change. NY: Teachers College Press.

Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. NY: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities in the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. (1997). A community of scholars. In Selected speeches. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Boyer, E. (1997). The scholarship of engagement. In Selected speeches. The

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Bruffee, K. A. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. College English, 48, 774.

Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. (1999). Information an applications for the Pew National Fellowship Program, the Teaching Academy Campus Program, and work with the scholarly and professional societies [Brochure]. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation.

Clark, G. (1994, February). Rescuing the discourse of community. College Composition and Communication, 45 (1), 61-74.

Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (1996). The American community college, (3rd ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). Building Communities: A vision for a new century. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Cross, P. & Steadman, M. H. (1996). Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). Interpretive interactionism. New York, NY: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (1998). The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Devall, W. B. (1968, spring). Community colleges: A dissenting view.

Educational Record, 168-172.

Diener, E. and Crandall, R. (1978). Ethics in social and behavioral research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Donmoyer, R. (1990). Generalizability and the single-case study. In E. W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate (pp. 175-200). New York: Teachers College Press.

Eisner, E. W., & Peshkin, A. (Eds.). (1990). Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College Press.

Erickson, F. (1973). What makes school ethnography 'ethnographic'? Council on Anthropology and Education Newsletter, 4(2), 10-19.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock, (Ed.), The handbook of research in teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 119-161). New York: MacMillan.

Flinders, D. J. & Mills, G. E. (Eds.). (1993). Theory and concepts in qualitative research: Perspectives from the field. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Frye, J. (1992). The vision of the public junior college, 1900-1940: Professional goals and popular aspirations. New York: Greenwood Press.

Frye, J. (1995). Expansion or inclusion: A question of intent. Community College Review, 22, 27-28.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays. NY: Basic Books, Inc.

Geertz, C. (1983). Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. U.S.A.: Basic Books, Inc.

Giroux, H. (1981). Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Giroux, H. (1983). Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T. & Maeroff, G. I.(1997). Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Greene, J. C. (1993). The role of theory in qualitative program evaluation. In Flinders, D. J. & Mills, G. E. (Eds.) Theory and concepts in qualitative research: Perspectives from the field. (pp. 24-45). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Guba, E. G. (1996). Commentary. In Heshusius, L. & Ballard, K. (Eds.). From positivism to interpretivism and beyond: Tales of transformation in educational and social research (The mind- body connection. (pp. 121-127). New York, NY:Teachers College Press.

Hall, G. (1974) Behind the bramble bushes: A mid-century history of the community college. Community College Review, 2 (3), 6-14.

Henstrand, J. L. (1993). Theory as research guide: A qualitative look at qualitative inquiry. In Flinders, D. J. & Mills, G. E. (Eds.) Theory and

concepts in qualitative research: Perspectives from the field. (pp. 83-102). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Heshusius, L. & Ballard, K. (Eds.). (1996). From positivism to interpretivism and beyond: Tales of transformation in educational and social research (The mind-body connection). New York, NY:Teachers College Press.

Hogan, J. M. (1998). Rhetoric and the restoration of community. In Hogan, J. M. (ed.), Rhetoric and community: Studies in unity and fragmentation (pp. 292- 301). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Howe, K. R. (1998, November). The interpretive turn and the new debate in education. Educational Researcher, 27 (8), 13-20.

Hutchings, P. & Shulman, L. S. (1999, September/October). Teaching among the scholarships. Change, 31 (5), 11-15.

Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. (1968). The academic revolution. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company.

Jennings, F. G. (1970, March-April). The two-year stretch. Change, 15-25.

Kelly, C., Shamblin, L. & Whitaker, T. (1998). Scholarship and the community college. Unpublished manuscript, North Carolina State University.

Kelman, H. C. (1982). Ethical issues in different social science methods. In T.L. Beauchamp, R. R. Faden, R.J Wallace, Jr., & L. Walters (eds.), Ethical Issues in Social Science Research. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kent, T. (1991, December). On the very idea of a discourse community.

College Composition and Communication, 42 (4), 425-445.

Kent, T. (1992, December). Reply by Thomas Kent. College Composition and Communication, 43 (4), 524.

Kintzer, F. C. (1973). Middleman in higher education. London: Jossey-Bass, Ltd.

Kutz, E. (1997). Language and literacy: Studying discourse in communities and classrooms. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mahaffey, J. and Welsh, M. F. (1993, summer). Scholarship and the vitality of a community college faculty. Community College Review, 21 (1), 31-40.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). Designing qualitative research (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshood, N. (1995, summer). Community college administrators and faculty scholarship: A pilot study. Community College Review, 23 (1), 51-62.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mohr, M. M. (1996). Wild dreams and sober cautions: The future of teacher research. In Donoahue, Z., VanTassel, M. A. & Patterson, L. (eds.). Research in the classroom (p. 117-123). Newark, DE: International

Reading Assoc.

Monroe, C. R. (1972). Profile of the community college. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Morgan, D. L. (1997). Focus groups as qualitative research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nagy, P. (1999). The [the case study's] Community College Fact Book. NC: Department of Evaluation & Research Services.

Neuman, W. L. (1994). Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Palmer, J. C. (1991, winter). Nurturing scholarship at community colleges. New Directions for Community Colleges, 76, 69-77.

Palmer, J. C. (1994). Faculty practices and attitudes as teachers and scholars: A review of research. In G. A. Baker III (ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and mangagement (pp. 423-435). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Peck, E. & Secker, J. (1999, July). Quality criteria for qualitative research: Does context make a difference? Qualitative Health Research, 9 (4), 552-558.

Porter, J. E. (1992). Audience and rhetoric: An archaeological composition of the discourse community. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pressler, C. A. & Dasilva, F. B. (1996). Sociology and interpretation: From Weber to Habermas. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Quehl, G. H., Bergquist, W. H., & Subbiondo, J. L. (1999, October). Fifty years of innovations in undergraduate education: Change and stasis in the pursuit of quality, 1 (4). Center for the Study of Innovations in Higher Education.

Rafoth, B. A. (1988). Discourse community: Where writers, readers, and texts come together. In Rafoth, B. A. & Rubin, D. L. (eds.), The social construction of written communication (pp. 131-146). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Rafoth, B. A. (1990). The concept of discourse community: Descriptive and explanatory adequacy. In Kirsch, G. & Roen, D. H. (eds.), A sense of audience in written communication (pp. 140-152). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Ratcliff, J. L. (1995). The excitement of discovery and the perils of premature conclusions. Community College Review, 22, 27-28.

Roman, L. G., & Apple, M. W. (1990). Is naturalism a move away from positivism?: Materialist and feminist approaches to subjectivity in ethnographic research. In E. W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate (pp. 38-73). NY: Teachers College Press.

Rudolph, F. (1990). The American college and university: A history (Rev. ed.). Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Safarik, L. & Getskow, V. (1997, summer). ERIC review - Blending the voices:

Differing perspectives on the community college. Community College Review, 25 (1), 69-81.

Schiappa, E. (1992, December). Response to Thomas Kent, "On the very idea of a discourse community." College Composition and Communication, 43 (4), 522-523.

Schwandt, T. A. (1996). Notes on being an interpretivist. In Heshusius, L. & Ballard, K. (Eds.). From positivism to interpretivism and beyond: Tales of transformation in educational and social research (The mind- body connection. (pp. 77-84). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Schwandt, T. A. (1998). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues. (pp. 221-259). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott, J. (1995). Sociological theory. Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar Publishing Co.

Segner, K. B. (1966). A history of the community college movement in North Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Shulman, L. S. (1999, July/August). Taking learning seriously. Change, 10-17.

Shulman, L. S. (2000, February). Teaching among the scholarships. Presentation given at the Eighth American Association for Higher Education Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards, New Orleans, LA.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Townsend, B. K. and LaPaglia, N. (2000, summer). Are we marginalized within academe? Perceptions of two-year college faculty. Community College Review, 28 (1), 41-48.

Vaughan, G. B. (1984). Balancing open access and quality: The community college at the watershed. Change, 16 *(2)*, 38-44.

Vaughan, G. B. (1988, spring). Scholarship in the community college: The path to respect. Educational Record, 69 (2), 26-31.

Vaughan, G. B. (1991, winter). Scholarship and the community college professional: Focusing the debate. New Directions for Community Colleges, 76, 3-11.

Vaughan, G. B. (1995). The community college story: A tale of American innovation. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Wattenbarger, J. and Witt, A. (1995). Origins of the California system: How the junior college movement came to California. Community College Review, 22, 16-25.

Weidlein, E. R. (Ed.). (Sept. 1, 2000). The Chronicle of Higher Education: 2000-2001 Almanac Issue, XLVII (1), 36, 99.

Yin, R. K. (1993). Applications of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zito, G. V. (1984). Systems of discourse: Structures and semiotics in the social sciences. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Zwerling, S. L. (1976). Second best: The crisis of the community college. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendices

Appendix A
Interview Guide

The following list of research questions will guide the individual interviews with the informants in this study:

BACKGROUND

1. Name
2. How long have you been at [the college]?
3. Which department
4. Current position
5. Degree(s) earned

DEFINITIONS

1. How would you define the word scholarship?
2. How might scholarship be defined differently for community colleges and universities?
3. How do you feel about the following definitions of the word scholarship: (show them copies of definitions offered in current literature by George Vaughan, Ernest Boyer, and the Carnegie Teaching Academy)?
4. What are some examples of scholarship that are evident among community college administrators and faculty at [this college]?
5. How important is it that CC admin. and faculty engage in scholarship?
6. What do you do that you consider to be a form of scholarship?
7. What has influenced you to engage (or not engage) in scholarship?

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

1. How does [the college] approach the issue of scholarship?
2. What may impede a CC person from engaging in scholarship?
3. How do you promote scholarship within your department and elsewhere on campus?
4. Who engages in scholarship at [the college]? How do you know?
5. Who should engage in scholarship?
6. How is scholarship rewarded/recognized at [the college]?
7. How might funding affect people's attitude about scholarship?

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

1. Describe some changes that have occurred within the past five years that may have an impact on community college scholarship. (PROBE: discourse community, pay, publications, policies).
2. How have or will these changes affect you?
3. How might these changes affect CC faculty and administrators in the future?
4. How would you feel about being asked to engage in scholarship for merit pay or promotion?
5. How would you feel about being required to engage in scholarship as part of your job description?

Who else at [the college] would be good for me to talk with about community college scholarship?

Appendix B

Introductory Letter to Focus Group Participants

June 11, 2000

Dear _____ :

As you may already be aware, in addition to being your colleague, I am pursuing a doctoral degree in Higher Education Administration in the College of Education and Psychology at NC State. I am in the process of conducting my doctoral research, investigating the nature of community college scholarship and discourse. This is a case study; it involves me interviewing and looking at documents at this institution that will help me come to a better understanding of the nature of community college scholarship and discourse here.

I have identified you as someone who might be willing to share your knowledge and perspective on this topic and act as a key participant in the study. Specifically, what I am requesting is that you agree to participate in a focus group made up of eight faculty members (this focus group will last roughly two hours), and then agree to be interviewed individually as a follow-up data gathering activity. Obviously, all interviews will be confidential and your identity will be known only to me. The follow-up interview should take less than one hour. The questions will cover these basic areas: background questions regarding your position(s) at the college, definitions (including your understanding of the word scholarship as it is understood within the context of this college), institutional culture as it relates to this study, and future changes relevant to this study. I would appreciate the option for a collaborative interview with you as the study progresses, if necessary. In order to talk with you more freely, I would like to tape record all interviews.

Ideally, I would like to conduct the focus group interview within the next two weeks. I will call your office in the next few days to talk with you about your willingness to participate and, hopefully, to arrange a convenient meeting time.

Sincerely,

Christine Kelly-Kleese
Director, Campus Learning Center

Introductory Letter to Individual Interviewees

July 24, 2000

Dear _____ :

As you may already be aware, in addition to being your colleague, I am pursuing a doctoral degree in Higher Education Administration in the College of Education and Psychology at NC State. I am in the process of conducting my doctoral research, investigating the nature of community college scholarship and discourse. This is a case study; it involves interviewing and looking at documents at this institution that will help me come to a better understanding of the nature of community college scholarship and discourse here.

Your name was given to me as someone who might be willing to share your knowledge and perspective on this topic. Obviously, all interviews will be confidential, and your identity will be known only to me. The interview should take roughly one hour. The questions will cover these basic areas: background questions regarding your position(s) at the college, definitions (including your understanding of the word scholarship as it is understood within the context of this college), institutional culture as it relates to this study, and future changes relevant to this study. I would appreciate the option for a follow-up interview if necessary. In order to talk with you more freely, I would like to tape record the interview.

Ideally, I would like to interview you within the next two weeks. I will call your office in the next few days to talk with you about your willingness to participate and, hopefully, to arrange a convenient meeting time.

Sincerely,

Christine Kelly-Kleese
Director, Campus Learning Center

Appendix C

North Carolina State University
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Community College Scholarship: An Intrinsic Case Study

Principal Investigator: Christine Kelly-Kleese **Faculty Sponsor: Dr. George Vaughan**

INFORMATION
You have been chosen as a key informant for this study. Specifically, you are asked to participate as a member of an initial focus group, participate in a follow-up individual interview, and recommend other faculty members whom you think have information critical to this investigation. You will be asked the same questions in the follow-up interview that were asked during the focus group interview. The focus group interview will last two hours; each individual interview will last approximately one hour.

RISKS
Participants will be asked to be as forthcoming as possible within their own determination of comfort-level. All focus group participants will be interviewed one-on-one after the focus group interview; therefore, you will have an opportunity to share additional information in this setting, thus reducing any potential risk in sharing of information you may feel uncomfortable sharing in the focus group.

BENEFITS
The topic of scholarship within academe is highly debated within current literature and among professional organizations and associations. This research will contribute to the discourse, adding a community college view of the issues.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

COMPENSATION
For participating in this study, you will be offered a small token of my appreciation upon completion of the interviews.

CONTACT
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Christine Kelly-Kleese, at 686-3386 (W) or 929-5900 (H). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Gary A. Mirka, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7906, NCSU Campus.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT
I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Subject's signature _____
Date _____

Investigator's signature _____
Date _____

North Carolina State University
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Community College Scholarship: An Intrinsic Case Study

Principal Investigator: Christine Kelly-Kleese **Faculty Sponsor: Dr. George Vaughan**

INFORMATION
Your name has been provided by another faculty member who recommends that you be included in this study because your perspective and opinions may have bearing on the research. You are asked to consent to a one-on-one interview, which will last approximately one hour.

RISKS
Participants will be asked to be as forthcoming as possible within their own determination of comfort-level.

BENEFITS
The topic of scholarship within academe is highly debated within current literature and among professional organizations and associations. This research will contribute to the discourse, adding a community college view of the issues.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

COMPENSATION
For participating in this study, you will be offered a small token of my appreciation upon completion of the interviews.

CONTACT
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Christine Kelly-Kleese, at 686-3386 (W) or 929-5900 (H). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Gary A. Mirka, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7906, NCSU Campus.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT
I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Subject's signature _____
Date _____

Investigator's signature _____
Date _____

Appendix D

Definitions of the term Scholarship

Vaughan (1988):

Scholarship is the umbrella under which research falls, for research is but one form of scholarship. Scholarship results in a product that is shared with others and that is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product . . . Scholarship requires that one have a solid foundation in one's professional field and that one keep up with the developments in that field (p. 27).

Boyer (1990 & 1997):

Scholarship is the university professor's responsibility to service, for meeting the practical needs of society. He defined scholarship as engagement, which requires the professor to engage in four functions of scholarship: discovery, integration, sharing knowledge, and applying knowledge. His insistence on practicality, on serviceability, focused attention on scholarship as more than research. His presentation of sharing knowledge as more than research and publication opened up the definition to include teaching as a valid expression of scholarship; scholars must teach students as a means of keeping scholarship alive, he argued; teaching sustains scholarship.

Lee Shulman and the Carnegie Teaching Academy Campus Program (1999):

The **scholarship of teaching** is problem posing about an issue of teaching or learning, study of the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies, application of results to practice, communication of results, self-reflection, and peer review (p. 11).

Appendix E

Informant Information

Twenty-five informants were included in this study. Two are upper-level administrators; twenty-two are full-time faculty members (some also serve as faculty supervisors); one is a continuing part-time faculty member (thirty hours per week, with benefits).

When an informant's comments are attributed to him/her within the study, a pair of letters takes the place of his/her name. The following guide is offered to give readers a bit more information about informants whose comments are used in the text:

AA	A full-time faculty member and administrator in the Industrial and Engineering Technologies Department
BB	A full-time faculty member in the Health Technologies Department
CC	A full-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
DD	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Public Service Technologies Department
EE	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Developmental Studies area
FF	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
GG	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Public Service Technologies Department
HH	A full-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
II	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Business Technologies Department
JJ	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Public Service Technologies Department
CKK	The researcher; a full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Educational Resources Department
LL	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Health Technologies Department
MM	A continuing part-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
NN	An upper-level instructional administrator
OO	A full-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department

PP	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
QQ	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
RR	An upper-level instructional administrator
SS	A full-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
TT	A full-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
UU	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Public Service Technologies Department
VV	A full-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
WW	A full-time faculty member in the Arts, Science, and University Transfer Department
XX	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Industrial and Engineering Technologies Department
YY	A full-time faculty member and Program Director in the Health Technologies Department
ZZ	A full-time faculty member and instructional administrator